

Ancient Peoples and Places

S I C I L Y

General Editor

DR GLYN DANIEL

DR GLYN DANIEL *Ancient Peoples and Places*

SICILY

BEFORE THE GREEKS

L. Bernabò Brea

78 PHOTOGRAPHS
50 LINE DRAWINGS
AND 7 MAPS



New York
FREDERICK A. PRAEGER

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

NINTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR, HALL OF NATIONS, HOTEL WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 16 TO JANUARY 19, INCLUSIVE

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

JANUARY 16, 1943

NO. 1

TUESDAY MORNING SESSION

Presiding: Miss Ruth Morgan

Opening Statement

CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT:

THIS year being our ninth, it might be well to review that for which we have stood for these eight years so that we can answer when people say, "What does the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War stand for?" We are presenting one paragraph for such a statement today, others will be presented later.

There is no place in the world where treaties are so outspoken in regard to the need to settle disputes without war as in the case of treaties between Latin American countries. Now there are threats of war between Bolivia and Paraguay. It seems proper that we should express our belief that ways other than war will be found for settling this conflict.

When the century of which we are a part is reviewed at its close, and when it will be asked What has been the greatest and most commanding issue of this century, the answer will be—the abolition of war.

Resolution

The following resolution was passed, each delegate voting as an individual and not as a representative of an organization

"We are gratified by the endeavors of the Administration, the Secretary of State, and the Commission to the Pan American Union Conference at Montevideo, in furthering good will, better understanding, and actual plans for peace in the Western hemisphere, and it is our earnest hope that those efforts will ultimately establish peace between Bolivia and Paraguay. We are further gratified by the assurance of the President in his Woodrow Wilson Foundation dinner address that he does not favor armed intervention by the United States in any Latin American country. With this expression of policy the delegates assembled at the Ninth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War heartily coincide."

STATEMENT BY JOSEPHINE SCHAIN, Chairman of the Program Committee:

The program falls into two general parts (a) the evening sessions deal with the political issues, (b) the afternoon sessions deal with economic issues related to the establishment of peace.

In a desire to secure as much participation of the delegates as possible, the committee has arranged for this in (a) the participation of chosen delegates in the panel discussions, (b) the group discussions of the Thursday morning session, (c) the discussion of the findings of these groups in the Friday morning session. Two high spots of the program are the tea at the White House on Wednesday afternoon and the banquet on Wednesday evening.

Advances and Retreats Made on the Peace Front During the Past Year

By WALTER VAN KIRK

ALTERNATING lights and shadows have played upon the stage of human affairs during the past twelve months. To many persons the shadows have wholly obscured the dim outlines of that warless world toward which mankind has been groping since 1918. These persons are steeped in pessimism, and they regard the outbreak of military hostilities upon a world scale as being inevitable and imminent. To others the lights, while not shinning with their one time brilliance, have been sufficiently powerful to penetrate the gloom and point the way toward a more promising future. These lights and shadows should be analyzed and their significance for the future appraised.

Speaking first of the shadows, I should point out that a tide of nationalism swept over the world in 1933, manifesting itself in the military, political and economic relations of nations.

Japan has been and continues to be the spearhead of contemporary military nationalism. Early in 1933, Japan completed her program of military expansion upon the Asiatic mainland. A puppet state was created in Manchuria, Jehol was overrun by the Japanese military, and Japan's "sphere

of influence" was extended southward beyond the Great Wall of China. In February the Assembly of the League of Nations took action which reaffirmed Chinese sovereignty over Manchuria, and which denied the claim that Japan was acting in self defense. Every nation which voted upon the League's report voted for its adoption—every nation save Japan. A few days later Japan made public her intention of withdrawing from the League of Nations. Meanwhile the League, acting upon the suggestion of the United States, voted to ask the nations to withhold recognition from Manchukuo. There the matter stands. In the end Japan will lose. It is the testimony of history that nations which lean too heavily upon the sword sooner or later suffer an ignominious defeat.

Military nationalism has manifested itself in South America. An undeclared but no less real war has been in progress between Bolivia and Paraguay, while between Colombia and Peru military operations were resorted to.

Economic nationalism has been a serious threat to the world's peace during 1933. Nations are in a mad race to establish their economic independence of other nations, a vain and inglorious hope. The World Economic Conference, which convened in London in June, met for the solemn purpose of bringing to an end the economic anarchy which had prevailed throughout the world for many years. The conference, it had been said, would provide for economic planning on an international scale, stabilize currencies and adjust tariff barriers in the interest of world justice and peace. This conference, as we all know, was a dismal failure. There can be no permanent peace in the world so long as nations ignore the problems arising out of the maladjustments of an unrestrained economic imperialism.

Political nationalism, in Germany and elsewhere, has been a disturbing factor in world relations during the past year. Hitler, in late January, was named Chancellor of the German Reich. In March he won a sweeping victory at the polls and the national revolution became an accomplished fact. Hitler's foreign policy called for the disarmament of the principal powers, and, failing that, the rearmament of Germany, the restoration, in part, of the German colonies; the revision of the Versailles Treaty, and the solution of the problem of the Polish Corridor.

Unsuccessful in his attempt to achieve equality in arms and impatient with the frequent delays which had obstructed the progress of the Disarmament Conferences, Hitler summoned his representatives to return from Geneva. Germany walked out of the Disarmament Conference and

gave notice of her intention to withdraw from the League of Nations. It was a dark and solemn hour. The League of Nations, built up through years of patient toil, was seen to be crumbling. Japan had left its fold, and now Germany. Italy, too, critical of League procedure, threatened to withdraw. It was being freely predicted in Geneva that the League was done for, that the efforts made to organize the world for peace had come to naught.

Meanwhile, the general European situation was daily growing more critical. The Germans and Russians were quarreling about trade agreements. Austria was defying the Nazi threat to overrun the Vienna government. Italy, critical of the League and plainly disgusted with the compromises attending the disarmament negotiations, threatened to withdraw from Geneva. France, despite the completion of her boundary forts, was showing signs of nervousness and talk of war was in the air. England, confounded and confused, ran hither and thither, first to Paris, then to Berlin, then to Rome, and then back to London. The Little Entente was suspicious of Germany. Poland was keeping her powder dry, the Daladier government had reached the end of its rope, and the fatal words "the next war" were found on the lips of millions.

During all of this time, as everyone knows, the World Disarmament Conference was getting nowhere. The British plan, submitted early in the year, which sought to apply definite figures and specific ratios to land and air forces, came to nothing. The Roosevelt message in May, addressed to the heads of fifty-four governments, had a "shot in the arm" effect on the conference but the effect of this superimposed stimulus soon wore off and the conferees were again in the doldrums of despair. Japan announced that she would not be a party to any disarmament treaty that would tend to maintain the naval ratios fixed at the Washington and London Naval Conferences. Then came Germany's withdrawal from the conference due to Hitler's refusal to accept a four or eight year probationary period as a prelude to a general reduction of arms. The conference adjourned and has not reassembled.

Meanwhile a new race in naval armaments has been getting under way. The fact that this race has proceeded under treaty rules does not make it any less a race. Japan is nearing her treaty quotas for all categories, aircraft carriers, destroyers, cruisers and submarines. England is stepping up her naval building and the United States is doing the same. We have launched the greatest naval building program ever launched in our peace time history. More than \$300 million have been appropriated by the Public Works Administration for naval building and other military purposes. Congressional leaders are now suggesting that an additional \$500 million be earmarked for future naval construction: We have gone mad. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars for naval construction at the very moment when schools are closing and children are obliged to walk the streets because there is no money with which to pay their teachers. The National Education Association estimates that 110,000 children

of school age are being denied education, 150,000 are being schooled in temporary shacks, 250,000 more are getting only part-time education. The association states that 18,000 rural schools are closed, 80,000 teachers are jobless, 30,000 being on relief. At a time when educational, social and cultural agencies are facing financial chaos the United States is participating in a military program that makes a prior claim upon our national wealth.

It will be seen, therefore, that there have been occasional retreat movements on the peace front during the past year. The League of Nations marched up the hill in protest against Japanese aggression and as promptly marched down again. Certain nations have ignored both the spirit and the letter of their peace commitments. The foundation of the world's peace machinery has cracked at several points. Armaments are on the increase. An economic nationalism still runs amuck. War talk is prevalent.

Numerous advances have been made on the peace front during the past year. From the standpoint of the peace movement in the United States several advances have been made.

The withdrawal of the marines from Nicaragua has been completed. For nearly twenty years the military of the so-called "Octopus of the North" have occupied the territorial domain of one or more of these Central American and Caribbean countries. The Nicaraguan government has regained control of the National Bank and the National Railroad and United States influence has correspondingly waned. Within thirty days after the withdrawal of the marines from Cuba the Nicaraguans settled their differences, Sandino, the alleged rebel, declaring that he had fought only against United States' intervention.

The policy of the Roosevelt administration toward Cuba deserves the warm support of the peace loving people of the nation. Had Mr. Roosevelt followed the example set by his predecessors, the marines would be in Havana at this very hour. The President, at the Wilson dinner, in December, announced the broad outlines of his "New Deal" for Latin America. The policy of the United States from now on is to be one of non-intervention. There is to be no more sending of American military forces over the boundary lines of the nations to the south of us. If this pledge is kept, as I believe it will be, one of the most prolific sources of international friction on the Western hemisphere will have been removed. Heretofore the military has been used for the protection of the financial investments of American banks and of American citizens. This is a tremendous gain for peace.

Another advance has been the recognition of Russia by the United States. The Senate has confirmed the appointment of Mr. Bullitt as United States Ambassador to Moscow, the Soviet Ambassador has been officially received in Washington, and the stars and stripes still flutter in the breeze. This act has debunked many of the self-appointed guardians of the nation's liberty and this has been a victory for the cause of peace. The recognition of Russia by the United States will considerably improve the prospects for peace

in the Far East and it will facilitate the restoration of economic sanity among the nations.

Another gain for peace has been the acceptance by the Roosevelt administration of the principle of consultation with other nations whenever war threatens. At Geneva, last year, we reversed our policy in this respect. Our representative, Mr. Norman Davis, announced not only that the United States would consult with other nations in the interest of peace but that this country, if its judgment concurred with that of the nations in question, would so interpret its neutrality at a time of international crisis as not to interfere with any common program of action intended to restrain an aggressor nation. Slowly but surely we are being forced to abandon our position of political isolation from the rest of the world. The isolationists still talk but it will take more than the eloquence of Senator Borah to halt the march of events which is bringing the United States, with or without our consent, into intimate and inescapable contact with other nations.

The World Disarmament Conference, despite its apparent failure, has registered certain notable gains for peace. The so-called aggressive weapon, it is agreed, must be abolished. Heavy artillery, heavy tanks and bombing planes, however dear they may be to the mind of the military strategist, have lost caste at the Geneva Conference. It now remains to be seen whether the statesmen have courage sufficient to put into treaty form their tentative agreements regarding the abolition of aggressive weapons.

We have learned a great deal during recent months regarding the traffic in arms and munitions. It must be clear to every thinking person that progress toward peace will be painfully slow until the manufacture of arms and munitions is nationalized or placed under strict national control and the international traffic in arms and munitions is placed under strict international control.

Other advances toward world peace, from the standpoint of the United States, have been the agreements for reciprocal trade pacts between our own and Latin American countries, the successful outcome of the Montevideo Pan American Congress, and the declared willingness of the administration to abrogate the Platt Amendment to the Cuban Constitution.

QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Question. Are the pronouncements of a President binding upon subsequent administrations?

Reply. With almost no exception the policies of one administration in international affairs have usually been accepted by succeeding administrations. A previously adopted policy seems to be morally binding.

Q. If, as you say, Japan has been and continues to be the spearhead of contemporary military nationalism, would it not be wise to build up our navy as a defensive gesture?

R. From a moral point of view, no. In all history, there are no instances in which the armaments of one nation have produced such fear on the part of other nations as to cause a warless situation. Competitive armaments, rather, have actually led nations into war.

Q. Would it be possible and logical to start

172.4
C74
JUN 11 '35

a movement for legislation leading toward an embargo on arms?

R Yes The difficulty is that we in the United States do not have as easy a time as other countries in securing data on the armament industry.

Q Is there any validity in the argument that the navy should be built up to serve as a bargaining element in the discussions of 1935?

R It is interesting to note that any limitation of navies that has been achieved in the past few years has not come about through the use of the bargaining power Moreover, the argument that a person with weapons must be met by a person equipped with similar weapons, in order to come to an agreement, is morally indefensible In the long run, gestures of faith and goodwill will be much more apt to lead to peace

cannot be done save as we attack the problem of international life; controlling our own production of goods in terms of their relation to world markets

LAWRENCE DENNIS *Financial Penetration.*

We must remember that the function of finance is to facilitate the doing of things that people want done 1 The functioning of finance may bring about ends which may make for war In this sense financing is significant for war in so far as it aims at ends which are war provoking 2 Financing creates problems for peace in the arrangements which are entailed

There are three major forms of foreign investments 1 Direct loans in terms of bonds and mortgages, 2 Direct investments such as those made by rubber companies, for example, 3 Short term investments

If Mr Jones wishes to buy a foreign bond it is necessary for his country to have a favorable balance of trade This favorable balance of trade controls the amount of investments which a country can make in another country Bankers and investors are interested in foreign investments because they want a favorable balance of trade Every country wants this The United States had it from 1914 to 1924; England lost it before the war and Germany with the war Many political philosophers acknowledge that in times of so-called peace, nations really are at war in their attempts to secure opportunities for foreign loans

ELEANOR DULLES *Protecting National Living Standards.*

In commenting on Mr Dennis' suggestion of the inevitability of economic war in times of peace, one could suggest that he refers to enterprises promoted by governments and carried out by discriminatory practices In contradistinction to this, if these were carried out as in our own country through state to state, or city to city relationships, there might be a normal process of economic relationships rather than warfare The problem arises when one nation tries to raise its standard of living at the expense of the standard of living of other nations.

Some few nations can have a fairly high standard of living on the basis of their own internal resources, but there are menaces in attempts to secure a self-contained standard of living, some products will cost you more if you produce them for yourself, again, whatever stability one nation builds up out of artificial political measures will be the cause of fear, speculation and suspicion in other countries. We need to contrast instruments which would enforce (1) nationalism with (2) those that would enforce internationalism Instruments for (1) are tariffs, subsidies, various types of laws, cultivation of the spirit of nationalism These engender friction, uncertainty and selfishness The instruments which would enforce (2) are mainly those which would build for understanding between the nations, understanding which would bring about the spirit of world planning Nationalism is a pair of crutches, we must find a more normal way of life, we must make our short-run attempts at cures in line with broad gauge long-term principles and policies which

TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Presiding: Dr. Meta Glass

Round Table: Some Basic Obstacles to Peace

Maxwell S. Stewart, *Chairman*

The Urge for Territorial Expansion; Struggle for Markets; Financial Penetration; Protecting National Living Standards.

MAXWELL S. STEWART We are passing through a critical period in history, the policies now being formed in the capitols of the world will determine the world's future The answer to the question, why war, is not simple We can take two ways to remove the basic causes of friction or to bring peaceable methods to the solution of the world's problems Hitherto the peace movement has emphasized the second way; illustrations, education in regard to the World Court, the Kellogg Peace Pact, the League of Nations, etc

Many now are saying that this method is not sufficient, that so long as nations fear basic economic injuries there can be no world cooperation The real symptoms of war are fundamental economic disorders This discussion is built around this consideration.

J B. MATTHEWS. *The Urge for Territorial Expansion.*

The basic problem is due to the unequal distribution throughout the world of raw materials important for the new economy—a monopoly not in land but in capital One country controls 50 per cent of the world's petroleum, another country is the chief supply of rubber for the whole world, one continent controls the greatest power resources of the world, such raw materials as cotton, sugar and wheat are not produced in such ratios as to make possible a political equilibrium among the nations of the world This makes for an inevitable friction In this struggle new forms of control have developed, diplomacy, financial domination, etc. With the advance of industrial society came the power age and the implications of the power age, run counter to the political forms that have developed This situation today constitutes the main peril to the peace of the world and seems to make almost universal the problem of redrawing the map of the world in terms of economic resources

Two points are impressive in the problem of peace today. 1. The demand for territorial ex-

pansion, especially in the Far East, has produced more cynicism in regard to the instruments of peace than any other factor 2 The economic problem in regard to the struggle to control economic resources has increased the problem of the world in controlling its armaments

We are at the heart of the problem of peace when we are considering the need to redistribute the resources of the world

JOSEPH BARNES *The Struggle for Markets.*

This struggle for markets is an old problem arising whenever men have sought to exchange the products of their labor In this struggle markets are considered worth fighting for The changes in this struggle in recent years are due not only to the increase in the volume of trade in the past one hundred years, the struggle is now intensive as well as extensive for we need no more explorers to discover new markets

Markets can be created or seized A new market may be created in developing the desire of China for industrial products, it is alleged that the Japanese policy in Manchukuo represents an attempt to seize a market Other changes in the struggle for markets are as follows More control of foreign trade by cartels, trusts, combines, the identification of governments in foreign trade enterprise, the paralleling of the struggle to secure markets for export with the struggle to preserve home markets against the exploitation of other nations

The United States came into the imperialistic stage in world affairs too late for a large share in colonies The open door policy is now recognized by many as a shrewd move to replace colonial empire with a trade empire.

There are two principal causes in explanation of the post-war sharpening of trade rivalry 1 The remaking of the map of Europe, creating new units which have developed policies of high protection 2 The industrialization of the Far East

There is no easy answer to the problem In fascist states the answer is "Autarchy," let each nation take care of itself This is a counsel of despair

Question What can we do about it? (Mr Stewart A typical feminine question)

Reply Many things, perhaps, (1) an elaborate machine to control economic conflicts, to subject these forces to intelligent planning. (2) This

would secure eventually the building of a world plan.

Q. Would it be practicable for a country which had a high standard of living to set up high tariffs and a country having a low standard of living to adopt a correspondingly lower tariff basis?

R. From the standpoint of *realpolitik*, yes. A country would have, however, to protect itself at times from "dumping," and complicated legislation would carry some menace.

Mrs. OSCAR S. MARX. One cannot help but be astonished at the insistence of all the speakers that the basic obstacles to peace are economic. There are other menaces to peace, I do not admit that "basic" and "economic" are synonymous. Certain psychological and social elements need to be emphasized. Even in an economic world Utopia you would still have the menace of war unless certain psychological and social elements were other than they are today. There are innate prejudices, religious intolerances and race antagonisms which, although they may have arisen out of economic causes, still remain as elements leading toward national hatreds.

If we all had open minds we should all be tolerant, but education hands us ready-made ideas instead of teaching us to think. In our homes we pass on hatred and intolerances; in schools we cultivate them in our studies of civics and history; in the world at large we develop them through the press, the pulpit and the cinema. Education has failed the peace movement. One might well ask whether these obstacles to peace are not more contributory to war than economic issues.

R. MR. DENNIS. I did not mean to say that economic problems are basic; neither the communists nor the fascists would say that economic difficulties are basic in social maladjustments. I agree with Mrs. Marx that to promote a better order among the peoples of the world we shall have to cultivate religious, cultural and ethic values. Economic mechanisms rest back on these values.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I did mean to say, with all emphasis, that the basic problem of peace is economic. Note that the social and cultural reorganization of Russia predisposes a drastic rearrangement of property matters. In that sense the economic problem is basic.

Some say that nationalism is a natural phenomenon, an affection for one's own country, but note that nationalism is subjected to two artificial enforcements. 1. One must not only have affection for a given nation but one must stop one's affection at the borders. 2. This affection is not only for those whom you know in a given country, but must be extended to all who happen to live there, despite whatever they may do. These two enforcements to nationalism would not occur save for the economic motive. Cultural, religious and psychological attitudes all go back to the economic struggle. There is a delightful touch of irony in the fact that the speaker who made this point is named "Marx!"

Q. Is nationalism more important as a cause of war than economic rivalry?

R. If nationalism is a psychological phenom-

enon, no. If nationalism is a complicated series of adjustments in terms of economic needs, yes. Nationalism is a way of thinking.

Q. Cannot means be devised for settling economic conflicts peaceably?

Mr. MATTHEWS' Way Out. Yes, but those solutions are not possible with prevailing economic systems that have grown up since the Industrial Revolution. We must remove competition in the use of raw materials, this is the only solution. Instead of passing the problem on to fundamentalists who think traditionally in regard to economic order, we must put the power for change into the hands of those who have moral resources for changing the world. Moral resources are in direct proportion to the absence of privilege and unjust power.

Mr. DENNIS' Way Out. Much as I may criticize many policies of the present administration I believe that Mr. Roosevelt is headed in the right direction. The trend of his policies is toward the promotion of peace, recognizing that some of the ideals such as the hope for world markets, are no longer to be relied upon. There is no mechanism in existence for international control, we do have it, however, for national control. This does not mean that we need to eliminate foreign trade. Rather, we must secure stabilization in lines of control through national governments, for this alone will work in a modern world.

Miss DULLES' Way Out. The crux of the question lies in what we mean by planning and its reasonable expectation. To follow national planning which stops short at the borders of a country is not the road to the kind of planning that the world needs. Planning within industries which has grown up in past years needs both national and international correlating, and international correlation is the more important of the two.

Mr. BARNES' Way Out. I would merge Mr. DENNIS' hard-headed realism with Miss DULLES' ideal of world trade. I have little confidence that any nation can eliminate the need for world trade, nor will the abolishing of tariffs solve the problem. We must control the surplus of manufactured industrial goods, we must lend surplus capital reserves of one region for the development of other regions in the world. Only then can we have the will to peace.

Mr. STEWART. This discussion leads us into the topic for tomorrow afternoon. Would National Self-Sufficiency Prove an Aid to Peace.

JAMES G. McDONALD. *Interlude.*

BRING back from Europe one clear impression so far as America is concerned, and that is that the leadership of the President of the United States is the most exciting and inspiring factor in the world today. I make no brief for the Roosevelt program because, having been out of the country, I lack the knowledge. I am sure, however, that he is proving to the world that dictatorship is not essential to effective government action. Nothing is so needed today as the proof that a democracy can function.

German Refugees. There are 50,000 to 60,000 refugees outside of Germany today. What the

size and number will be in the next few months one can only guess. The conditions in Germany itself are not in our province, but the problem of refugees is one which we must consider in the light of other situations. The situation in the Reich is extremely difficult for the children, difficult as it is for adults. This is not a Jewish problem, even though the majority of the refugees are Jews. My presentation of this to you is as a Christian problem. Christian and non-Christian are what they are because of policies made by men who bear the label of Christian. If the Christian world and its leaders are unwilling to face the responsibility, then Christianity is merely lip service.

My plea to the leaders of Christian organizations in the United States is to take additional responsibility not alone to raise funds, but, more important, to give to fellow non-Jews a sense that they are carrying a moral responsibility in this crisis, particularly where injustice is carried out in racial theory.

Note. The two printed pamphlets to which Mr. McDonald referred were a reprint from the New York Times summarizing the details of the work for German refugees and *Jewish Children in Germany* by Stephan Zweig.

WHO'S WHO

BARNES, JOSEPH, Secretary, American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations.

DENNIS, LAWRENCE, Foreign Service Officer, Department of State, 1919-27; author.

DULLES, ELEANOR, Research Associate, Industrial Department, Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania, lecturer, Bryn Mawr College.

MATTHEWS, J. B., Secretary, Fellowship of Reconciliation.

McDONALD, JAMES B., High Commissioner for German Refugees.

STEWART, MAXWELL S., Research Associate, Foreign Policy Association, New York City.

VAN KIRK, WALTER W., Secretary, Commission on International Justice and Good Will, Federal Council of Churches.

Program Errata

Thursday afternoon. Add name of Mrs. Sherwood Anderson to round table participants.

Friday evening. Because of illness Dr. Louis L. Mann is unable to be present. Dr. Morris Lazaron will make the final address.

Through an error the slogan of last year's program "WAR AND WASTE" was printed on this year's program. The printer evidently thinks it good.

Information on and extra copies of the *Delegate's Worksheet* may be secured from the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, 1116 Grand Central Terminal Building, 100 East 45th Street, New York.

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

NINTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR HALL OF NATIONS, HOTEL
WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 16 TO JANUARY 19, INCLUSIVE

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

NO. 2

TUESDAY EVENING SESSION

Presiding: Mrs. Grace Morrison Poole

Planning for a New World Society New Nationalist Philosophies and Their Effect on World Peace

BY CARLTON J. H. HAYES

THE most fundamental and difficult problem of today is proud, selfish, narrow nationalism. This has developed from the localism or cosmopolitanism of early times to a faith that the nation has the highest claim on one's devotion and loyalty. There have been two phases in this development: (1) In the 18th century and the greater part of the 19th century, nationalism was associated with humanitarianism, free trade, international peace, (2) Modern nationalism is in the phase represented by Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, Japan and, to some degree, trends in our own country.

There are seven novel features of modern nationalism which has been emerging for the past thirty or forty years.

I *Unprecedented absorption in industrialization and material and economic values* This has had two major effects. Capitalists have tended to develop cooperation on a national scale in cartels, monopolies, trusts, et cetera, the working population has become increasingly mobile and, as a result, has developed a desire for state help because the workers are no longer bounded by their local communities. Both of these facts have contributed to a general desire for a nationally controlled industrial life.

II *An absorbing interest in biology* Every country now has a very sizable literature on race purity.

III *The exaltation of force and heroic virtues.* Certain ideas of Darwin such as the "struggle for existence" and the modern development of the philosophy of pragmatism resulted in the idea that if a thing succeeds it must, therefore, be good. Thus, the test for national supremacy was the test of military victory.

IV *The emergence of the doctrine of the superman, attended by the trend toward dictatorship.* There are three sources for this doctrine: (1) Nietzscheism, (2) the influence of the Marxian doctrine of class conflict, and (3) the growing popular devotion to efficiency.

V. *The enormous development of the means*

for shaping and controlling nationalist public opinion This is largely manifested in systems of education, the enormous circulation of newspapers and magazines, the movies and the radio.

VI *The tendency toward uniformity, leading toward a fairly ready acquiescence of the masses to accept a leader*

VII. *Nationalism in its extreme form has become a compelling, moving, emotional religion, as fanatical a religion as the world has ever known*

The great question of today is not whether Hitler or Mussolini is or is not doing a great work. It is, rather, whether the system of which they are symbols is to push us all into savagery

and tribalism. Unchecked nationalism furnishes the psychology for war.

QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Question What could be done through such an organization as the Parent-Teachers Association to combat nationalism in the schools?

Reply Read the report of a Commission of the American Historical Association to be published by Scribner's in the next two months.

Q. How much of the element of fear is there in extreme nationalism?

R. Much, but pride is equally important. Despite the psychologists, there is considerable freedom for the individual reason if it has some real data for consideration.

Note: Two books by Carlton J. H. Hayes, *France, the Nation of Patriotism* and *Essays in Nationalism*

WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

Presiding: Miss Ruth Morgan

Declaration on World Court

MRS. CATT presented a statement on the World Court which was unanimously adopted by the conference delegates, each delegate voting as an individual and not as a representative of an organization. This will be sent to the President and to the Congress of the United States.

Adherence to the Permanent Court of International Justice has been an outstanding issue in this country since 1925. It is doubtful if any question has been more generally espoused by public opinion than has the desire to see the United States a member of the World Court. A majority, at least, of the newspapers of the United States have editorially endorsed the World Court and thus they continue to do from time to time. The most important organizations in the United States representing large or an exceptional character of membership have recorded themselves as being favorable to the adherence to the World Court. Among these are the American Bar Association and twenty-three state bar associations: Arkansas, Connecticut, Minnesota, New York, West Virginia, Rhode Island, Montana, Washing-

ton, South Dakota, Nebraska, Virginia, Vermont, Missouri, Ohio, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Hampshire, Kentucky, North Dakota, Idaho, Oregon, Texas; the United States Chamber of Commerce, and, among others, Chambers of Commerce in San Francisco, Pennsylvania (State Chamber), Philadelphia, Providence, Charleston, W. Va., New York (State Chamber), Spokane, Scranton, Los Angeles. The American Federation of Labor, the Federal Council of Churches, State Departments of the American Legion in at least seven states, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Education Association, the eleven organizations composing the membership of the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, and many more, have heartily endorsed the World Court and have entreated the Senate to take the necessary steps to secure the official participation of the United States in that body.

We have heard it said that popular opinion is not now as earnest for the World Court as it was a few years ago, but in 1932 both dominant political parties adopted a definite program favoring the adherence of the United States to the World Court, and in the year 1933 the State Legislatures of Ar-

kansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Vermont urged early action on admission to the World Court

We therefore beg the President of the United States to urge early and favorable action upon the United States Senate. Such evidence of positive approval of international peace would stimulate the faith of the entire world and be a recognition of the continuing public opinion which exists in this country for the World Court

Symposium: Armaments and World Peace

Dr. Mary E. Woolley, *Chairman*

DR MARY E WOOLLEY With the many causes of war represented in this program, the question of disarmament is a most vital one for many reasons (1) Much of the economic distress of today is at least partially due to the futile destruction of the world's wealth in building up armaments (2) Armaments make it impossible to disarm the minds of the people; they inspire fear, suspicion, distrust.

One of the advantages of this Conference is that we are able to see all sides of a question, this discussion presents the problem of armaments from several points of view.

The New Situation Created by the German Revolution

By ESTHER CAUKIN BRUNAUER

The National Revolution which took place in Germany during 1933 has had effects reaching far beyond German borders, and, quite specifically, it has thrown down a challenge to us, the representatives of an important section of the American peace movement

The German Revolution has undoubtedly created a new situation in the negotiations for reduction of armaments, and thus has brought about new problems for those who are working to build a structure of permanent international peace. The National Socialist movement, during all the years of its development, fought consistently against measures of international co-operation, and it is not surprising that the governments of other countries are frightened, now that the National Socialists are in power in Germany. This fear is, of course, utilized by elements in all countries that have already made every effort to block disarmament.

May 17 and October 14 mark the high points in the effect of the Disarmament Conference. Hitler asserted the demand of Germany for equality in armaments, the second time going so far as to withdraw the German delegations from the Disarmament Conference and to give notice of

withdrawal from the League of Nations. The main issue of the negotiations from which Germany withdrew was the modification of the Ramsay MacDonald plan, which Germany had earlier accepted as a basis for negotiation. The German government felt that this modification would only perpetuate and deepen the inequality of their country, and regretted the fact that the equality granted in December, 1932, to Germany, was being withheld from the Germany of 1933

The question whether the Germany of Hitler should be denied the equality of rights granted to the Germany of Brüning, is the most important and the most difficult to answer

The official pronouncements of Hitler during the past year would seem to hold the assurance that although the new government is to carry on its foreign relations more vigorously and sensationally than the old regime, the foreign policy of Germany in the future will not be essentially different from what it has been in the past. However, a close study of internal conditions in Germany indicates that, with adequate resources and instruments for warfare once at his command, Hitler would not hesitate very long to go to war if he thought that it would further the aims of his foreign policy to do so. Being unable to prepare Germany materially for war—on a sufficiently large scale, at least—the National Socialist regime is preparing the country psychologically. As illustration, we may cite the political troops (SA, SS, and Stahlhelm), the work service camps, the youth organizations and the propaganda of the Air Defense League. That the peaceful utterances of Hitler during 1933 are designed chiefly for foreign consumption is indicated by the fact that the National Socialist Yearbook for 1934, a text for every member of the party and every supporter of the government, carries the following quotation from Hitler: "Suppressed German lands will not be brought back into the bosom of the common Reich by flaming protests, but by a powerful sword."

If there exists one chance out of a hundred that international war can be indefinitely postponed and ultimately prevented, such groups as the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War must bend every effort toward making that one chance a certainty. Because our chances of success rest upon such a narrow basis, we must be more alert than ever to the need of effective and realistic methods in the light of accurate facts on the new situation presented by German events. We must always distinguish between our ultimate aim and the means by which we hope at any one time to accomplish it. Our aim is to maintain international peace, and for several years we have concentrated every effort on the reduction of armaments as the best means of attaining our end. The new situation created by the German revolution raises very seriously the question whether this concentration on disarmament will actually help the world toward permanent peace, or whether the peace forces need to go to work along a new line. I am not prepared to suggest what this new line of action

might be; I am not even certain that the work for disarmament ought to be dropped or diminished, I do urge, however, that the members of this Conference consider very seriously, now, and in the next month, how the American peace movement may meet most effectively and realistically the new situation created for us by the German revolution.

The Armament Industry and Peace

By H C ENGELBRECHT

For some years the peace movement has had its attention called to the menace of the arms industry through a type of sensational news stories. In Germany it is said that three armament makers contributed to Hitler's campaign fund, including a manufacturer in Czecho-Slovakia. Six months ago the Hitler government ordered six airplanes from English manufacturers, this order was stopped by the English government. A machine gun factory in Poland is now manufacturing for the Soviet government. China buys 37.5 per cent of its armaments from Japan.

There are three points at which to watch the relation of the arms industry to the causes of peace. 1 *The home market of the armament manufacturers.* France is the largest producer of arms in the world; she sells to forty or fifty countries, yet only 15 per cent or 20 per cent of the total product of France is exported. For the United States it would take sixteen years of exporting arms at our regular rate of export to equal one year of our own expenditures on a single item of our military budget. 2 *Watch exports of arms in times of war.* During the war years the amount of money from the sale of stocks in the basic industries of the armaments industry increased to stupendous amounts, in the case of one industry this amount increased from \$6 million in four peace years to \$49 million in four war years. 3 *Watch the armament industry in times when disarmament is being discussed.* A few years ago French papers carried articles entitled "The Dangers of Disarmament," at the same time asking contributions for the campaign against disarmament.

Conclusion: 1 Since arms manufacturers sell practically 90 per cent of their product to their home governments, we must use every effort to keep our own military budgets down. At least 40 per cent of these budget items go directly to the arms industry. 2 Since armament manufacturers operate during peace times to the end that they may sell in war time, we must get bills through Congress which make it impossible to sell arms to a nation which is in war. We must secure an embargo against arms in the case of belligerent nations. 3. We must get behind a movement for disarmament. The peoples of the world cry for peace, but the world's political situation is becoming increasingly intense.

Moral Disarmament

By F VINTON LINDLEY

The word, moral, has today somewhat the same connotation as the word, bustle, it seems to be an old-fashioned term. There are, however, new attitudes and new ways of thinking on old subjects and this is true of the old question of war. The name of this Conference suggests a scientific approach, it has a medical ring. Medicine regards all the socially destructive behavior as a symptom of disease, this is applicable to the disease of war. War is a disease of the human mind and the human heart. Today war kills off the best of human life, it is no longer a producer of socially preservative behavior.

Here are five specific recommendations for the treatment of this disease: 1 Education of the emotions. 2 The establishment of a course on war, its reasons for being and what can be done about it, in each school and college. 3 The continuance of anti-war activities through literature, conferences, movies, etc. 4 The establishment

of a youth movement which will oppose war as part of its platform and take action against it. 5 Disarmament.

Conclusion: We must find the thrill of peace which will compete with the thrill of war. It may be that in bio-chemical laboratories there will be waged the war of the future, the war against war, thus we may discover the forces that cause men to fight each other. War against yellow fever and smallpox today, why not war against war tomorrow.

DOCTOR WOOLLEY: There are two points for us to consider out of this discussion. 1. We have given to us a problem of vital importance on which relatively slight progress has been made—the problem of human relationships. We should be ashamed to admit that we stand daunted before this problem. 2. What can we do as individuals? a) Never take the defeatist position. “There will be no next war if the people do not want it.” b) Stand behind the President of the United States on every constructive statement that he has made or will make which looks toward a new and better international order.

QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Question: Is not the heart of the arms industry question the private manufacture of armaments?

Reply: On the face of it this is a good plan, but analyzing it more closely today there are only ten countries which produce arms. The nations have written into a dozen treaties and into the covenant of the League of Nations itself that the production of armaments shall not stop. Every nation that does not produce arms asserts that there is no justice in forbidding them to buy arms. Incidentally, Japan's armament industry has been nationalized ever since its beginning. Has it helped?

Q: If profits are taken away from the private manufacturer of arms by legislation would not this solve the problem?

R: Yes, probably, but this would be difficult for we would have to have a strictly rigid system of accounting.

Note a book by H C Engelbrecht entitled *Merchants of Death*.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Presiding: Mrs. D. Leigh Colvin

Round Table: Would National Self-Sufficiency Prove an Aid to Peace

Maxwell S. Stewart, *Chairman*

MR STEWART: The issue for today's discussion is as to whether the cause of peace would be most helped by 1 Developing national self-sufficiency or, 2 Reestablishing an economic internationalism. Which direction shall we take?

MR HARRY D GIDEONSE: Economic self-sufficiency is merely a new name for an old point of view. Those who stand for it are a motley group made up of those who want higher and higher tariffs and those idealists who desire a planned economy for the nation. They say that national self-sufficiency will lead to peace, assuming that pre-war attempts toward internationalism led directly to war. One question whether pre-war years really were a record of attempts toward international economics. Examples: Japan's attempts to develop its economic life met rising tariff and migration barriers of other nations, unemployment in Germany today has been caused by the economic nationalism of other nations and not by international policies in trade relations. The remedies, therefore, of the group who stand for economic self-sufficiency are apt to be as fallacious as their analysis of causes.

Here is a kind of national self-sufficiency which would not make for difficulties for peace. If national self-sufficiency were planned by “angels” whose national policies were consistent each with each and not, as so often, contradictory in intent

—then, conceivably a planned national self-sufficiency might result in a greater degree of control in the zones of conflict in international trade. We need to remember that conflicts between governments are a more serious menace to peace than conflicts between individual traders.

MR JOHN A RYAN: I am a free trader, but with certain qualifications. I am an internationalist, not a nationalist, for I believe that economic nationalism, as it has often been construed, is a menace to world peace. On the other hand, however, internationalism, so far as trade is concerned, is practically impossible in the kind of world in which we live.

In our modern world, with excess capacity for production, countries cannot find markets for all they can produce, nor are they able to take the products of other countries in exchange. It is absurd, therefore, to assume the existence of unlimited markets which would absorb these products.

My solution is that we set up particular tariffs with particular countries for particular goods. Here are three reasons for such a policy of economic self-sufficiency: 1 All other nations have adopted this policy. How can we change our policy in the face of this fact? 2 We can control our own economic policies, we cannot control the policies of other nations. 3 We can make a contribution to the world by setting our own economic house in order.

MRS L. HENRY FRADKIN: Is not the logical deduction of Mr Ryan's position the surrender of the United States of expectation of receiving

payment on all foreign obligations, including war debts? And, if he feels that we must be self-contained, what will become of the surplus products of our industrialized society?

MR RYAN: These debts can never be paid in any case. It is doubtful whether any nation can pay them within conceivable limits of time, nor would we be willing to take the goods of these nations in payment. As for the second question, the only way out is to shorten the hours of labor, produce less, or, perhaps, cultivate our capacity for consuming more goods.

MRS WACHENHEIMER: Would a self-contained nation increase or decrease its armament expenditures?

MR GIDEONSE: I can give merely a plausible forecast. There would probably be a revival of imperialism in an attempt to secure self-contained empires which would supply for themselves all needed raw materials. Jealousies would result and each nation would have to arm itself, either to protect its empire or, in the case of smaller nations, in the attempt to build an empire.

Question: In a self-contained nation, would it not be necessary to develop our consuming capacity to balance our producing capacity?

MR DENNIS: Yes, the development of internal markets is the solution for surplus markets. Prof Gideonse's position seems unrealistic to nationalists because it ignores the fact that free markets have completely broken down. Governments must therefore meet and find solutions for economic problems, those solutions may be either good or bad. If, in a self-contained nation, you

want to promote peace, influence the government so that its economic policies will create the minimum of international frictions and the maximum of international understanding

MR. GIDEONSE Mgr Ryan's position is consistent in his statement on war debts, although this attitude is not generally accepted by nationalists. Mr. Dennis' position is consistent with his general fascist philosophy Mgr Ryan's position on the problem of surplus products must be met by the inescapable fact that economic nationalism causes excess capacity of production

ROY VEACH If we need the intervention of the government in national economic life, why not the intervention of government in international economic relations?

MYRA SMITH, How about the small nations? Will not economic self-sufficiency bring treaties between the smaller and larger nations which would endanger peace? Shall we not need a kind of international planning? There may be a fallacy in aiming in one direction and starting to walk in another.

JEANETTE RANKIN. Does national self-sufficiency carry with it a nationally self-sufficient army and navy? War is a method of settling things temporarily as against solving them fundamentally. Do away with war and the same basic problems would probably remain Is there not a middle course between national self-sufficiency and internationalism in economic life?

DR. HENRY CHALMERS. Yes, I believe that there is, that there is room for a composition of these two views. We must take an airplane and not a pedestrian point of view. For a time the world may need such rationings of production as represented by the wheat agreements, a limiting of production for the sake of the better balance between supply and demand. Such measures will be merely emergency means, and probably applicable only to staple products. An attempt to ration these products, as a final solution, would bring confusion, instability and temporizing.

Two things will characterize a possible middle road policy. Moderate tariffs and the use of the most favored nation principle

International cooperation, therefore, with such a policy would be the means, economic benefits to individual nations would be the objective

TEA AT THE WHITE HOUSE

THE delegates to the Ninth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War were guests of the President and Mrs. Roosevelt following the Wednesday Afternoon Session.

The President, in greeting the delegates, expressed great satisfaction because of the work which the women of the Conference are doing. He feels that in our modern civilization war has no place, and that he is sure that at least 90 per cent of the people are back of the program which the women are following

He said that he wished to speak particularly

of two points. First of all, he believes that we are doing an outstanding piece of education in bringing before the people the matters which have to do with peace and war. He would suggest, however, that we ought not to be satisfied simply with the fine educational work that is going on in this country, but that we should also turn our attention toward helping movements of similar education in other countries. The President stressed this point emphatically because he feels that we all have to move together, and that in certain countries the education for peace has not gone as far as it has in this country.

The second point concerned the necessity of having this education translated into the policies of our own government Here the President feels that we have made some outstanding advances during the past year. He cited the work which has been going on in the Montevideo Conference, and believes that the United States has made a notable advance in its policy toward the elimination of war. At this point the President smiled with great satisfaction, and said, "Never again shall the government of the United States intervene in the affairs of other countries in this hemisphere" The President hoped that by the forward steps which are being taken in this hemisphere we could set an example for the whole world.

As a second part of this necessity for translating our education into government policy, the President spoke of the Disarmament Conference. He said that here also the people of the United States were ready to take a forward step, and that he personally had proposed a very particular program, the first step of which would be to eliminate entirely the offensive weapons of aggression.

The President again made the same point that he had previously made, that the work of the women should not stop with the United States, but that they should try in every way possible to help to spread this idea of the abolition of aggressive weapons in the other countries. The United States, he added, would be the first country to agree to the abolition of these weapons as soon as the other countries are ready. The President in closing said that he thought that women could do better work than men in this education for peace, and that he not only wished us success in our present ventures but hoped that we would increase our efforts and work even harder

GENERAL OBJECTIVES

of the NATIONAL COMMITTEE on
the CAUSE AND CURE of WAR

1. To build effective peace machinery
2. To reduce war machinery
3. To obtain guaranteed security against war for every nation

OUR WORLD

An International Hymn to be Sung to
Beethoven's *Ode to Joy*

By CHARLOTTE PERKINS GILMAN

I.

Proud each nation's noble story,
Home defended, warriors bold,
Prouder still their common glory
When in peace our world we hold.
Sovereign states whose high devotion
Long each country spent alone,
Joining over land and ocean
For the world they make their own.

II.

World of peace, where wealth and beauty
Safe at last may spread and grow,
Strong in justice, clear in duty,
Wise in all the good we know.
Freedom for our lives unfolding,
Honor for all service done,
Highest gam each land is holding,
Ours, when all the world is one.

III

Light at last on our confusion,
Clear at last our human plan,
Bright and free from all illusion
Shines the rising hope of man.
Crown of all the climbing ages,
Goal of all the road we trod,
Grows on earth a social body
Worthy of the soul of God.

WHO'S WHO

BRUNAUER, DR ESTHER CAUKIN, Research Associate in International Relations, American Association of University Women.

CHALMERS, DR HENRY, Department of Commerce.

ENGBRECHT, H. C, Associate Editor, *World Tomorrow*.

GIDEONSE, HARRY D., Associate Professor of Political Economy, University of Chicago

HAYES, CARLTON J H, Professor of History, Columbia University.

LINDLEY, F. VINTON, Recent Yale graduate—student and writer.

RANKIN, JEANETTE, National Council for Prevention of War

STEWART, MAXWELL S., Research Associate, Foreign Policy Association, New York City

WOOLLEY, DR MARY E, President of Mt. Holyoke College.

Information on and extra copies of the *Delegate's Worksheet* may be secured from the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, 1116 Grand Central Terminal Building, 100 East 45th Street, New York.

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

NINTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR. HALL OF NATIONS, HOTEL WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 16 TO JANUARY 19, INCLUSIVE

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

NO. 3

WEDNESDAY EVENING SESSION—BANQUET

A Story

By CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

IN THE last century there lived a remarkable family, the Hutchinsons. There was one daughter and seven sons, and they all played on all sorts of instruments and were good singers. They lived in Vermont. They sang for all the great reforms of the years before the Civil War. Tall, straight and dignified, they would rise from the back of the hall, march up the central aisle to the platform, and there sing their verse, inspiring the audience to great enthusiasm.

The greatest meeting that I ever read about was the meeting in Philadelphia celebrating the Declaration of Independence. This meeting was held in 1876 and was a country-wide celebration. A group of women, believing that the Declaration of Independence had nothing to do with women, decided to present their own declaration of independence, but the men who were responsible for the meeting were not so keen on this project. Finally five tickets were secured for the meeting, and five women pressed into the back seats on the platform. While the men were roaring their enthusiasm after the reading of the Declaration of Independence, these five women pushed to the front of the platform. It is said that the Vice-President of the United States, who was presiding, saw them and turned pale and trembling. Despite the shout of "Order," these women handed their declaration to the chairman of the meeting, who said never a word. Later, these women stalked out of the meeting and read their declaration of independence to thousands in the square outside.

Now the Hutchinsons were there at that meeting. At the end of the five-hour session of their own, which these women assembled for a discussion of their own needs for independence and responsible citizenship, the Hutchinsons sang their favorite song, "A Hundred Years Hence."

Mrs Vera Beggs, the chairman of the Marathon Round Table, will sing this song in the hoop skirt costume of fifty or sixty years ago.

OVERTURE

"A Hundred Years Hence" Sung in Costume by Mrs Vera Beggs.

"A Hundred Years Hence." Words modern-

ized by Charlotte Perkins Gilman and sung by the American University Male Quartet.

MRS CATT (Introducing Mrs. Roosevelt).

We have something in this country that no country has or has ever had. We have a President of the United States who has come into office with a New Deal. George Washington must have had a new deal, but the other Presidents have gone in on an old deal, and have kept it up. Even more remarkable, this President has a wife whose speeches sound like echoes of a combination of "Love thy neighbor as thyself," and the Golden Rule.

I cannot present to you the wife of this President. I can only say—"Mrs. Roosevelt."

Address

By MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

I FEEL that this is a great opportunity tonight. I have not been with you for a number of years. I was with you, I think, for the first two years in which your Conference met, and it seems to me that in the interval the Conference has grown, greatly grown, and that is very encouraging. What I want to say to you tonight I do not believe could have been said when we first met, because then we were very conscious of our different groups, of what each one of us represented. We may now be just as conscious of those groups but we have merged the groups much more into the cause for which we are meeting here, the one cause for which many different groups of women can whole-heartedly combine.

I want to talk to you perhaps rather seriously, because I think that we must try to be practical about this cause and not entirely idealistic. Ideals are grand things to hold always before us, but we have to move step by step, if we are learning nothing else in this country, we are learning that before we can do anything, we have to be willing to face the facts, to know what the truth is about any condition before we attempt to go forward.

The facts about peace are these. We talk a great deal about wanting peace and everyone, with one voice, is saying "Nobody wants war, we all want peace", we hear that from every country. Some years ago a small boy remarked to me about religion, "You know, the only reason that

I cannot go along on religion is that so many people talk about it but do not live it." We are doing exactly the same thing about peace. We do not like to sit down and face the causes that bring about war, but we have got to begin there. We have got to face the fact that there are economic causes which bring about war. We are learning in this country to face facts about economic causes, and many people, many groups of people, are learning that they have to change their ideals, they will have to change their ways of living, perhaps, they have to change their values. In the same way we must know the economic questions arising between nations more realistically than ever before.

We can have a League of Nations, a World Court, a Disarmament Conference and, unless we are willing to tell each other the truth, and to face the real causes which make nations jealous of each other, greedy of each other, hate each other, we shall get nowhere. All these instruments are methods which can be used if the spirit is right, if the people really want to succeed.

Now people, primarily men, because I talk a great deal with men about this matter, constantly say to me, "We cannot have peace because human nature cannot be changed, we cannot have peace because governments will not be honest with each other." We shall not have peace as long as human nature is not changed, as long as governments will not be honest with each other. How are we going to change human nature, how are we going to get governments to be honest with each other? We shall have to start with settling economic questions, we shall have to settle economic questions at home and then we shall have to make up our minds whether we will face the facts as to why we have wars. We shall have to face the necessity to be honest with ourselves, to give up some things ourselves, and not to expect that other nations will give up everything. We shall have to make up our minds on what is worth giving up in order to make it possible for other nations to get to the state of mind where they also can reach a decision on what they will be willing to give up.

All of us must live. In our own nation some of us are going to have to give up many things in order that all of us may live. Now the same thing is going to hold good between nations; therefore I hope very much that we are going to look upon this question as an active crusade that women the world over must undertake. We must undertake it largely with the youth of our countries because, after all, most of us are getting old and it is our children and our grandchildren

who will see the fruits of what we may be beginning now

A man said to me the other day, "You believe that youth today is less attracted by the glamor of war than it was twenty or thirty years ago. Are we losing the sense of patriotism in this country? Would not youth today all rise to the call to the colors as they have in the past?" Well, I do not know, but I think that there is a distinct change in the thought of our youth today. War is not as glamorous a thing as it was in the days when I was young. Then there was no other way of proving great patriotism save the sacrifice of giving yourself to your country in time of war. That was the supreme thing to do for your country. We have come now to a different conception. We have not yet solved this question because we have not yet found in this country a real place for youth. But we are getting to it, and I think that the germ of what I like to call the New Patriotism is coming to us from youth. They are much more ready to meet changes. They are much more ready to make sacrifices, but they have got to be given the feeling that they are really serving. It was this idea of serving that made war the great patriotic gesture. It was a feeling that you were serving in the finest way possible. Something has to be substituted for that feeling.

Some one wrote me very critically the other day—or perhaps it was an editorial—about a small article that I had written, suggesting that perhaps we could begin with little children and change the type of their toys. I was asked what would happen if my husband had to call the boys to the colors. I was very inconsistent, the criticism went on, in preaching this giving up of military toys. What a silly, foolish suggestion! Was I advising anything to take their place? How were children going to be interested in villages, domestic animals, people who were plowing? Such toys were nothing to give them in place of those toy soldiers, they could not give the old feeling of patriotism, so my critic asserted.

I agree that you have to give youth something else, a way of serving. I believe that there are many ways of serving and that we are going to find natural ways before we live many more years. It is probably the women who have got to lead this double crusade, a crusade to establish new ways of serving and a crusade against waste.

All of us of my age know what waste the World War was, not only in this country but in every other country. I spent three years in school in England and know France very well and a few years ago I took my two youngest boys to those countries—they had never been abroad before. We went through many small villages in England, Scotland and Wales, and in every single village there was a central monument with more names on each of these monuments than it seemed that there could possibly be people in the village. They were the names of the boys and men who had died in the World War.

Then we went to France and one day one of my boys said to me, "There is a funny thing

about motoring over here, you see only old men or very young ones coming out of the fields." "Yes," I said, "there are old men and very young ones, there are some a little bit older whom you saw playing at war over the same fields where the war had just come to an end and where the generation just older than they had been completely wiped out." One generation was getting ready for the next war and one generation was gone out of the population, out of useful production, two whole generations were taken for quite a period of years. Then we passed through acres and acres and acres of white crosses, representing all the nations of Europe. If that is not waste, I do not know what is. It is waste of people, not for a short time but for a long time. Out of all that waste has come what we have been through in these past years, not only in this country but in every country.

I believe that any one who thinks must think of the next war as they would think of suicide. But most people do not think!

How many of you saw the film, "Cavalcade"? I know a number of people who saw it not once but several times. I saw it just once. I was in school in England during the Boer War, and every single step of "Cavalcade" I could follow. I could not bear to see it more than once.

I came out feeling the utter futility of human experience, feeling how deadly stupid we are. How can we study history, how can we live through the things that we have lived through and complacently go on allowing the same causes over and over again to put us through those same horrible experiences? I can not believe that we are going to go on being as stupid as that. If we are, we deserve to commit suicide—and we will!

The New Nationalism

By MISS RUTH MORGAN

A GOOD many people object to the fact that nationalism is becoming stronger everywhere and that in its worst manifestations it possesses some very odd features, dangerous to any good understanding. Perhaps the worst of them is conceit. You probably remember the story, told so well by Artemus Ward, of Archimedes, and the conceited peddler. Archimedes decided, after a good deal of thought, to extract the conceit from the peddler and was very much astonished when there proved to be nothing left!

My plea is a simple one. We must possess ourselves of a regard for the United States, a determination to be worthy citizens under its flag and to guard its interest, but we shall perish miserably if we do not understand that this newer phase of nationalism, which combines in about equal parts conceit, isolation and sometimes aggressive war, will blind us to our own true interests.

Have you read of all that Benjamin Franklin suffered when he tried to persuade the citizens of Philadelphia that a post-office and a police force, which would take care of the letters of the

community and the safety of the individual families, were possible—in other words, that there was a community of interest which they must serve together? True nationalism must serve the family of nations.

Unless we are able to feel that the community of nations must represent the good of each and every nation, we shall not get very far. I plead with you not to be too easily evidenced of your extreme worth as a citizen of the United States, but to be very sure that your country, while serving its own, has the good of all other countries forever in mind.

The Price of Organized Peace

By MRS. MARGERY I. CORBETT ASHBY

IT IS a great privilege to me to be your guest here at this Conference on the Cause and Cure of War. It has long been my ambition to attend its meetings, to hear your discussion of the contribution which the United States can give to the solution of the world's problems.

I believe that we are faced in these years with one of those decisions which in the past have changed history. Such was the change from paganism to Christianity, the change from a system of state ritual and ceremonial to a standard of personal responsibility. Christianity won through on the personal initiative and choice of thousands of obscure men and women. It was the same response of thousands of individuals to a new sense of obligation and duty that produced the renaissance of the new learning and the reformation of the ancient church.

Can such conferences as these enable thousands today to perceive the needs of the times and courageously agree to new duties and responsibilities?

1933 saw the indefinite adjournment of the World Economic Conference and successive interruptions to the world of the Disarmament Conference. Japan and Germany gave notice of their intention to leave the League of Nations, and the new system of open conference gave way to the old system of secret diplomacy. Why have these conferences failed when all peoples desire so passionately peace and prosperity?

Is not the failure due to the fact that Governments and peoples hesitate between two roads; they wish to retain their isolation, their absolute sovereignty, and yet gain the advantages of cooperation; they wish to get, but are unwilling to give.

The World Economic Conference of 1927 was composed of experts, economists, representatives of industry, shipping, banking, men (and a few women) who took long views, who sought a wide basis for world prosperity. They were unanimous that tariffs must be stabilized and lowered, that budgets must balance, that quotas and restrictions on exchange must go. But in the face of home political difficulties no government was prepared to sacrifice small present gain for future

security The crisis which followed is the result of their reluctance

The second World Economic Conference, that of London, 1933, was composed entirely of government representatives, strictly confined by national mandates, and the conference adjourned indefinitely

If the Disarmament Conference adjourns indefinitely it will be because, though the great Powers wish for disarmament, they are not willing to pay the price at which they can obtain disarmament The aim of the proposed limitation and progressive reduction of armaments is to achieve greater national security for all To the Anglo-Saxon mind disarmament tends to be a concrete and isolated problem We believe that to reduce the huge costs of armaments will diminish fear and suspicion and add to general prosperity The rest of the world believes that disarmament can only be achieved as part and parcel of the national organization of the world for peace by a system of mutual assistance and the abandonment of the doctrines of neutrality The battle at Geneva and at London was, and is, between the "Isolationists" and the "Cooperators." The chief "Isolationists" are the two great Anglo-Saxon democracies and the Japanese The "Cooperators" are a large majority of the sixty-four powers gathered in conference Now as it is easier to defend the present system than to evolve a new world order, I believe that the Isolationists will win at this time with the following consequences There will be a new race in armaments by the great Powers, increased political tension, increased taxation and a lowered standard of living, increased insecurity of the smaller powers who cannot stand the enormous strain of competition in modern armaments and increased economic isolation This process will continue until most countries will have done their best to become self-supporting at a low standard of living Where the economic unit is as large as that of the United States, the bad effects will be comparatively light.

Naturally, as a Britisher and a European, I am equally interested in the two aspects Increased armaments in our next budget will bring work to the heavy industries, and since we are heavy manufacturers for other countries their purchases will help to conceal the strain on the rest of our system We shall continue our efforts to reconcile the interests of home producers, empire producers and of our best customers who belong to neither group

The effects in Europe are already most interesting Having looked in vain to the two great Anglo-Saxon democracies for assistance, the European powers are quietly setting their own house in order without us A new great Power, equal in area, man power and organization to the others, has arisen in the close organization of the Little Entente (Czecho-Slovakia, Yugoslavia and Roumania) A new Balkan Entente seems at last to be within the range of practical politics, with the Bulgarian official visit to Yugoslavia Turkey and Greece have settled their age-long difficulties. There is talk of a Baltic Entente and, most significant of all, is the Eight-

The following cable was sent to the Conference by the Disarmament Committee of Women's International Organizations, with headquarters in Geneva.

GREETINGS, DISARMAMENT PROSPECTS IMPROVED. URGE CONTINUED SUPPORT THIS WOMEN'S WORLD PEACE EFFORT. LORD ROBERT CECIL PROPOSING DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE OF WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS FOR NOBEL PEACE PRIZE.

(signed)

THE DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, GENEVA, SWITZERLAND

The Conference, on hearing this cable, voted to send a cable to the Board of Awards of the Nobel Peace Prize, urging that this award be made.

Power Pact between Russia and her neighbors Can we Anglo-Saxons sit back with a contented sigh and leave these Europeans to settle their own affairs? Of course we can, but we ought to consider the price we are likely to pay for our irresponsibility It is fear, not reason, which is producing these groupings. fear of Hitler Germany with its official peace policy and its unofficial threats of aggression It is the old system of alliances which has in the past led to war. Even if Austria keeps its independence in face of the enormous economic gains that free access to Hamburg would give it, even if Hungary can be bribed into acquiescence, the result will be two armed camps in Europe with the consequent distortion of its natural economic life The advantages, however, to Europe will be a breathing space of peace, the repudiation of war debts and reparations, the repudiation of the most-favored nation clause and the formation of wider economic unities, the isolation of Germany within a circle too strong for her to break, but as compensation she will gain the moral satisfaction of complete freedom from the obligations of the Treaty of Versailles, freedom to re-arm, and will emerge again as a great power in Europe. Would such a result imply the breakdown of the League? Certainly not. The League is but a name for the permanent machinery necessary for consultation between governments Those governments which are not members find it useful to cooperate Consultation is necessary, and world conferences need such long and careful preparation that a permanent secretariat must be provided by some and used by all

The suggestions for the reform of the League will, I believe, prove quite impracticable. The machinery was drawn up by such single-hearted men as Smuts of South Africa, who cared only

for world peace and were not trying to get national advantage out of the manipulation of the machinery.

But after drawing such a gloomy picture I can offer you the alternative which, I believe, will triumph in the end We shall all become "Cooperators" We shall need to regard the world as a whole, as a "society of nations" A society implies duties, responsibilities and privileges for the individuals composing it We must build not on disarmament but on the Kellogg Pact.

First, we must accept the doctrine of non-aggression, of non-resource to force Civilized nations will bind themselves by a Hague convention to give protection to citizens and foreigners alike, but in uncivilized countries our nationals must go at their own risk without involving the home government in punitive expeditions

We must define aggression and the aggressor by a simple automatic definition on the lines accepted by the commission at Geneva in its five points

If we cannot reach world agreement on non-aggression, let us be content to begin with Europe In either case we must accept a simple method of establishing the fact of invasion or attack by means of the service attaches of the different capitals, now working as national servants, but when with an added international duty to perform as servants of a permanent disarmament commission.

We must recognize that our armaments are our neighbors concern as well as our own, and accept supervision and control as effective and severe as we have admitted in the case of dangerous drugs

If we can derogate our national sovereignty to preserve our people from dangerous drugs, why do we hesitate in the case of the worse dangers which arise from swollen secret armaments? Is it not that we are afraid to face the vast interests involved?

Personally, I believe that the greatest service to peace would be the abolition of the private manufacture and traffic in arms.

In my country we believe that private manufacture is cheaper and capable of wider expansion, but when we call it cheap do we remember the whole cost of war scares, war intrigues and of armament influence on the press?

But if we are to have this society of nations we must not only provide machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes, we must declare ourselves ready to punish the aggressors by financial and economic sanctions promptly applied and, in the last resort, we must be prepared to use force It is to my mind impossible to pass at once from the present anarchy to a forceless world An intermediary stage is absolutely necessary to give any sense of security We need not only the court of justice, but the police

We must renounce all bombing from the air, drastically cut down our fighting airplanes in definite stages and accept internationalization of civil aviation by regional agreements, probably continental

Finally, we must agree to budgetary limitation

of expenditure and the setting up of an international air force as a striking force against the civil aircraft of any power that might be using civil aircraft as bombing planes.

You will object that such a plan crystallizes the frontiers of the Treaty of Versailles for all time. On the contrary, I believe that a mutual guarantee that these frontiers cannot be changed by war is the essential preliminary of any revision.

The frontiers are drawn in areas of such mixed populations that no frontier could be wholly satisfactory. Forbid any rectification by force, and, as the price of such security to the victors, insist that a Lytton Commission report on possible minor adjustments.

I believe, too, that a great obstacle in the way of better treatment of minorities is the fear of governments of an armed rising in aid of an invasion. Make an invasion impossible, and, as the price of such security, insist on the proper

treatment of minorities, with freedom of language, religion and culture.

The only permanent solution of the frontier difficulties is to make the frontiers invisible, that is to allow the freest possible movement of goods and men.

The incredible increase of wealth during the last fifty years was largely possible because the rising tide of production fed a rapidly increasing population. Now with still further production we find that populations are stable or but slowly increasing. We can pool our resources and achieve a high level for all, or we can break up the world into mutually exclusive units with enormous suffering and loss.

You will think me a wild idealist to make a plea for international cooperation at this moment when you are in the throes of a great national recovery, but such an international program needs long planning and courageous vision, and therefore I put it before you as a goal of our endeavor.

WHO'S WHO

ASHBY, MRS. MARGERY I. CORBETT,
President, International Alliance of Women
for Suffrage and Equal Citizenship, British
delegate to disarmament conference

BEGGS, MRS. VERA, Chairman of Marathon
Round Tables

GILMAN, MRS. CHARLOTTE PERKINS,
Poet and Lecturer

ROELOFS, MISS HENRIETTA, Vice-President,
National Conference on Cause and Cure
of War.

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

Presiding, Miss Ruth Morgan

Group Discussion: Translating Our Peace Ideals into Action

MRS. GERTRUDE KNOX WELLS, *General Chairman*, and MRS. MARY G. SCHONBERG, *Secretary*, explained the arrangements for the five discussion groups of the morning. (The findings of these groups will be printed in the fourth issue of the *Delegate's Worksheet*.)

Introduction to the Group Discussions

By HENRIETTA ROELOFS

IF you will examine the subject of our group discussions this year, Translating Our Peace Ideals into Action, you will see that it has a different quality as compared with similar discussions in past years. There have usually been three parts to any recommended program coming out of discussion groups at the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War: a.) Items for action; b.) Items for study; c.) Methods of work. This year the group discussions are concentrating on a.) Items for action.

What do we mean by action? We mean the securing of that culminating act on the part of proper government authorities which will get the thing done which seems to us necessary. These group discussions, therefore, do not discuss, for instance, what the World Court means; rather, what shall we do to help bring about that action

which puts the United States into the World Court.

How shall we limit the list of topics upon which we can have this kind of discussion? Though all of our records certain items have run consistently in each conference, such as the World Court, closer cooperation with the League of Nations, Armament Reduction, etc. Examination of these records also reveals that the status of these items has not changed materially in these eight years. We have an amazing record on the one hand of the study activities of our constituent organizations. On the other hand we have the fact that our government has not acted on these points so crucial to international relationships. We must close up that discrepancy. The time has come for more intensive effort in translating our ideals into action.

Do not worry over the fact that we are not going to discuss today how and what to study. It is axiomatic that our group never moves into definite action without previous study. This we take for granted. Lately we have set up even more careful arrangements for study through our Marathon Round Tables.

What topics shall we discuss? Why not the topics outlined by Mrs. Catt in the declarations which this year's Conference has been considering? Reduction of Armaments; Embargo on Arms, World Court; Latin America; League of Nations. Now that we have declared on them let us discuss what we can do to advance action in these fields.

In buying clothes, one considers a wardrobe

for the whole year, yet there comes a time for decision as to what you shall wear on a given morning. This Conference has its long term goals but we must discuss how we shall get specific action here and now on some of our objectives.

As in your groups you come to your decisions on what you wish the organizations to do to bring about the appropriate actions in these fields, remember to take into account the policies and practices of the eleven organizations. Be a little radical if you wish, but not too radical. The findings of the groups will be in the form of recommendations to the constituent organizations. These findings, together with the declarations proposed by Mrs. Catt and adopted by the Conference, the Marathon Round Tables, the *Delegate's Worksheets*, together give us a well rounded program for the next year.

Note The declarations adopted at this session will be printed in the fourth issue of the *Delegate's Worksheet*.

Resources

Two pamphlets noted in Conference speeches.
Patriotism Limited,
The Secret International
Union of Democratic Control, 34, Victoria St.,
L.W. 1, London, England

Information on and extra copies of the *Delegate's Worksheet* may be secured from the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, 1116 Grand Central Terminal Building, 100 East 45th Street, New York.

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

NINTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR. HALL OF NATIONS, HOTEL
WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 16 TO JANUARY 19, INCLUSIVE

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

NO. 4

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Presiding: Mrs. Daniel A. Poling

The National Recovery Program—An Aid or a Threat to Peace?

Maxwell S. Stewart, *Chairman*

MR STEWART In the discussion of this subject may we put aside all partisan considerations and face these issues through our primary interest in basic questions of international relations?

DR HARRY A. GIDEONSE The implications of the N. R. A. are, like the implications of the tariff, rather misleading on superficial view. In the case of tariffs we may increase the duty on shoes to protect the American standard of living and yet charge more for shoes to consumers in the United States, a theoretical gain may therefore not be an actual gain. Similarly, with the establishment of N. R. A. codes we may not be really improving the domestic consuming power if, at the same time, we have a monetary policy for reducing the value of the dollar by 40 or 50 per cent. A measure of this kind must not be judged by immediate and apparent consequences. As yet we do not see the far international effects of the N. R. A. for the increase in costs to date have not as yet made marked change in our holding of foreign markets.

DR MORDECAI EZEKIEL The Agricultural Adjustment Act is described as an effort to solve the difficulties of not having enough for each person by producing less—starving ourselves rich!

The economic nationalism of the last decade amounted to this. Each country tried to sell as much as possible to other countries and to buy as little as possible from other countries. The farm relief measures in this country have in them the possibility of mutual adjustment between the nations. This will aid the cause of peace, and remove some of the economic causes of war.

Internationally, the wheat agreement will help to hold down excess production in the wheat exporting countries. In addition to wheat, sugar may possibly be put on a similarly coordinated system, and there is still fainter possibility for cotton.

The objective of the Agricultural Adjustment Act is to improve conditions in the United States, thus simultaneously improving them in other countries.

DR LEO PASVOLSKY The international aspects of our country's monetary policy are concerned with questions of international trade and international finance relationship. It is necessary for international trade to have a monetary basis for it, each country defining its basic monetary unit in terms of a fixed quantity of gold by which the monetary units of all the countries can be compared. We refer to this as the gold standard.

Personally, I am convinced in regard to the vital necessity for international trade. A monetary policy, therefore, which brings with it a mechanism of stable foreign exchange is vitally important to the peace of the world.

MRS SHERWOOD ANDERSON Does forced depreciation of the dollar lead to international conflict?

MR PASVOLSKY A great many things must happen between depreciation of currency and war. The answer to the question depends upon whether you call economic warfare "war."

MR GIDEONSE My answer would be different. Consider the fact that the French, by bitter experience, think of deflation as a social ordeal,

that Hitlerism is the reaction of the German middle class against deflation, that with the dollar at sixty cents this country will be a magnet for the gold of the world. These are hints in the direction of another kind of answer to Mrs. Anderson's question.

MRS MAUD SWARTZ Have the workers and the farmers in this country been wrong in supporting high tariffs as a benefit to them?

DR EZEKIEL By the last census figures only seven million out of the fifty million laborers in the United States are engaged in labor which would suffer from free trade.

MR STEWART The confusion in the discussions of the past three days arises from the fact that we have two sets of issues: a) The issue between the nationalists and the internationalists; b) The division between those who would restore the laissez-faire system and those who believe that economic activities should be regulated and controlled. Both the nationalists and the internationalists are torn between accepting either one of the two alternatives in (b).

The basic decision before us is our choice of the trend of our national economic policies, shall it be in the direction of international cooperation or shall it be nationalism? The intermediate path seems now to be closed. We must decide at least how to coordinate between these two approaches to our economic policies.

THURSDAY EVENING SESSION

Presiding, Mrs. Harrie Chamberlin

Planning for a New World Society

Principles of American Policy in Relation to the Far East

BY STANLEY K. HORNBECK

POLICY is a term designating attitude, objective, desire, intent. Foreign policy in this country has its roots in the minds and hearts of 125 million people. Our foreign policy has been a slow growth influenced by the forces which have characterized our history: streams of migration, our occupation of the land, our development of resources, our attempts to make a nation; our attempts to become a nation among the nations.

In recent years we have had a new objective, our desire for world peace. We are now up against the age-old problem of international relationships, and, as Americans, we want to do something about it. Our foreign policy is a projection of our own desire for "equality of opportunity," into international policies. Do the American people understand that a price will have to be paid for this objective in our national life? Will they pay a fair share for world peace? The answer lies in the future.

A common error is in failing to distinguish between principles of foreign policy and their execution, or application, in action. Incidentally, the making of a decision is termed action.

Our Far Eastern policy has been shaped by our

belief that "free states" must remain free. The Hay Notes of 1899 culminated the history of the sixty preceding years of our relationships with the Far East, adding to our policies the idea of cooperation with other powers. Twenty-two years after the Hay Notes the powers concerned committed themselves in the Washington Conference to prescribed courses of action. With the signing of the Pact of Paris, sixty-three states adopted a new principle condemning recourse to war as a method for settling international difficulties. The people of the United States are inclined to take that Pact seriously. We have come to the belief that our best contribution to world affairs is in a way other than the way of coercion in enforcing settlements.

The principles of our policy in relation to the Far East are not separate from the general principles of our foreign policy as a nation. From the beginning that policy can be characterized as the "good neighbor" principle. In the field of military action we believe in the use of force only for the purpose of preventing or combating the force of others which imperils our American citizens in other countries, and then only under law, national and international.

What the Manchurian Conflict Has Taught Us

By GROVER CLARK

The action of the military-dominated Japanese Government in these past two years has challenged the dependability not only of the pledges which the nations have given to settle their disputes by peaceful means but also of the sanctity of all international agreements. It has cast serious doubt on the effectiveness of the world's peace machinery.

This is grave enough. But much more is involved, and we shall fall far short of realizing the full significance of what has been done and not done if we think solely in terms of Japan's relations with China or of the Nine Power Treaty, the Pact of Paris and the League of Nations. Involved in these developments and their outcome are two fundamental questions. Are the nations of the West really ready to deal with the nations of the East as equals? Does the West really mean business when it pledges itself to peace and enforced justice in international relations?

The developments in relation to Manchuria are part of the consequences of the growing revolt of the East against Western domination. They also are the application of the lesson which the West spent four hundred years trying to teach the East. By furnishing the means for quick and widespread communications which made possible the dissemination of these ideas, the Western nations also loosened the soil so that the seeds which they were planting could take root and grow.

Those seeds now are beginning to bear fruit, in the struggle of the Indians and Filipinos for independence; in the increasingly active assertion by the Chinese of the demand for complete con-

THE NINTH CONFERENCE

The total registration at the Conference is 569, the second largest in the nine years of our history.

trol within their own country; in the rumblings of discontent and revolt in the Dutch and French possessions. The refusal of the group at present dominant in Japan to acknowledge any obligation to accept mediation from the West in this dispute in the East is, fundamentally, part and parcel of this revolt against Western dominance, which is seething throughout the whole Far East.

The problem of meeting the challenge presented by the Japanese military actions and the Japanese repudiation of its obligations under the League Covenant, the Pact of Paris and the Nine Power Treaty thus involves much more than the maintenance of these international commitments.

The particular issue of the future relations of Japan and China in Manchuria must, of course, be dealt with in terms of the basic equities involved and of the international pledges to settle disputes by peaceful means alone. Yet that issue can be dealt with adequately only as it is conceived of as part of the larger and more fundamental issue of the place which the Far Eastern peoples and nations are to have in world affairs.

To give reality to their protestations, the Western nations, in dealing with this particular crisis between Japan and China, necessarily must stand firm on the principles laid down in the international pledges to keep the peace.

The hope for peace between East and West rests on the West's demonstration, in the limelight of this crisis, that on its own part it has in reality turned from force to justice.

Group Discussion

MISS RUTH WOODSMALL. Since, as you say, Mr. Clark, peace in the Far East is retarded by the attitude of the West toward the East, and since the West can have no effect save as it goes to the East with clean hands, what is involved in "going with clean hands?"

MR. CLARK. One answer is that we, in the West, have given a good deal of consideration to disarmament. If we really mean peace, there is no reason why we should not disarm. If we do not disarm, we evidently do not mean peace.

Here is another point. I believe that in China, particularly, it is highly desirable to move rapidly toward putting our economic and cultural interests in the Far East upon the basis of our relationship as an extraterritorial power. From a business point of view alone, if foreigners have to impose protection for themselves, it is not so good. Our treaty in regard to extraterritorial rights expires in 1934. It ought not to go by default. The United States might make a declaration at that time that would be forward looking on this question of the relation of the government to the protection of foreign interests.

WM. C. JOHNSTONE, JR.: Are you suggesting

a policy of gradual withdrawal? Would the American people sit by and see chaos in China and the destruction of millions of dollars worth of American property?

MR. CLARK. It is interesting to note that certain foreign firms which have not appealed for extraterritorial rights in China, have made money despite occasional riots. It might be more appropriate for the American Government to compensate its citizens for losses in China than to send troops to protect them. I believe that it would also be cheaper in the long run.

MRS. HELEN MOORHEAD. Does "putting our house in order" have any relation to our concept of the League of Nations? Is the League to act for both East and West? You spoke as though East and West had specific and differing points of view.

MR. CLARK. We cannot have a world divided into two separate parts; we must live in a single united world. Perhaps we can use some such figure as this. The approach of the League of Nations to world relationships might be represented as a long, broad avenue, each house facing on this avenue. These houses, representing the nations of the world, ought to keep their own doorsteps, their own yards, clean. The League of Nations might be responsible for street cleaning!

MRS. MOORHEAD. But each house would have its own idea as to what cleanliness is. Would we not have a standard of cleanliness for all the houses? Would the League of Nations exert pressure for the fulfillment of common standards for international behavior or would this be done by the pressure of public opinion alone?

PIERRE DE LANUX. There are two positions in regard to procedures in world behavior. 1. One group believes that it is enough for a nation to say, "When war comes it won't be my fault." 2. Another group believes that we ought to see what can be done so that the "next war" will not happen. Abraham Lincoln said that no nation can be half free and half slave. We may well say that no nation can be half pledged to international cooperation and half free from international entanglements. Every nation has to choose at this point.

MR. CLARK. Here is one thing that you can do. An editor cannot print what the readers want unless they tell him what to print. If the attitude of your community newspaper is not such as you want it to be, in relation to the Far East situation, for instance, if it carries inadequate news—consistently and in cooperation with your friends, write, talk, telephone the editor in your community until he knows precisely what you want, especially, praise him when he does some things very well. I truly believe that such influence on editors would help both them and the general situation.

The failure of the League of Nations, if it is a failure, goes back in the end to the failure of people to realize the kind of world in which they now live. In such a world there is much evidence that it is cheaper to be peaceful than to fight! A commercial motive for peace, perhaps, but a powerful one!

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

Presiding: Mrs. Arthur Brin

Findings of the Group Discussions of the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War

Adopted, January 19, 1934

Techniques for Translating Our Peace Ideals into Action

I. Reduction of Arms

- a Expressing our opposition to increased naval expenditures and the use of Public Works Administration funds for this purpose
- b Strong backing, spiritually and financially, of the Women's Disarmament Committee at Geneva by
 - 1 Becoming a "Friend of the Women's Disarmament Committee" through individual or joint membership by the payment of \$1.00 (25 Quai Woodrow Wilson, Geneva, Switzerland, your own check if you wish or a postal money order).
 - 2 Keeping this Women's Disarmament Committee informed in regard to public sentiment on the question of reduction of armaments and in regard to the progress of our own work
 3. Cooperating in the program suggested by the Women's Disarmament Committee at Geneva.
- c Allying ourselves with women working for peace in other countries of the world, for example
 1. By interchange of reading lists on specific subjects such as those on the investigation of armaments.
 2. Strengthening the international contacts of our own individual organizations which are international in set-up
- d. Making contacts with the American delegates to the Disarmament Conference at strategic times indicated by our own national organizations
- e Trying for precision in definition of terms used by our own speakers on peace questions

II. Embargo on Arms

- a Have local meetings on the question of munitions manufacture Have these meetings, especially in the states manufacturing arms, to stimulate interest in the national question of manufacture of arms
- b Ask our own Senators to introduce bills for the effective investigation of the sale and export of arms
- c Ask our own Senators for information in regard to the increased activity in munitions plants and in regard to interlocking directorates of munitions plants Act quickly in this matter
- d. Support an adequate measure for em-

bargo on arms during this session of Congress.

III. World Court

- a Have the constituent organizations of the Committee on the Cause and Cure of War in each state join in pressure upon one Senator to make a speech on the floor of the Senate asking for the reporting out of the World Court Protocol
- b Arrange for a World Court Day celebration upon the reporting out of the World Court Protocol from Committee
- c Stimulate local editorial comment upon the World Court
- d Get opposition Senators to state publicly their reasons for their opposition Refute these reasons publicly, featuring the arguments of the favorable Senators
- e Ask the Executive Committee of the Committee on the Cause and Cure of War to appoint a special committee to work out a united campaign on the World Court.

IV. Latin America

- a Watch for opportunities, when pertinent, to commend the Administration upon its Latin American policy
- b Concentrate our attention upon specific problems as they arise in Latin American policy, such as the implications of the Platt Amendment in our relations with Cuba.

V. League of Nations

- a In our educational work on the League, concentrate public attention on the possible revision of the Covenant in such a way as to make it more acceptable to the sentiment of the United States.
 - 1 Study amendments to the Covenant, already proposed in Geneva, as published by the World Peace Foundation
 2. Work for signatures to the petition now being circulated by the League of Nations Association

GENERAL SUGGESTIONS FOR TECHNIQUE

- Do not forget the tried and tested techniques of the past such as. the press, radio, letters, questionnaires to prospective candidates, personal interviews, etc
- Make close contact through our constituent organizations with the women in other lands working for the cause of peace
- Encourage the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War to take more responsibility for guidance in strategy to achieve our specific objectives
- Encourage our national committee to help to develop more effective means of getting together our eleven organizations for state work, in the absence of a state Committee on the Cause and Cure of War or other joint committee, we suggest the appointment

of a convenor in the state, who will be ready to call together the various organizations

Organize for specific purposes along congressional and precinct lines

Foster in every way the accurate teaching of history in the schools of the country

The Present Status of the General Disarmament Commission

By MRS. MARGERY I. CORBETT ASHBY

ANYTHING that I may say this morning represents my personal point of view, comments on various sections of the document on the agenda for the meeting of the General Disarmament Commission at the end of this month

The first section on "security" presents great difficulty. The main cleavage is between countries which believe that disarmament is a problem underlying security, and those countries which believe that security must be achieved before disarmament is possible. There is still great difference of opinion in regard to the results of "consultation." Shall "consultation" result in a decision as to which nation is the aggressor or shall it define what constitutes the act of aggression in a given instance? Suggestions made by Soviet Russia rule out so-called legitimate reasons for invading another country. They also rule out the protection of foreigners in other lands. Work at The Hague is now going on, looking toward a new outlook on this question of the protection of foreigners in other countries.

It is quite clear that if armed invasion is a test of aggression, states must then control the provocations which so often lead to aggression.

Who is to see how such measures can be carried out? There are risks involved in some of the suggested machinery for inquiring into the facts in situations of aggression. These risks, however, are not as great today as the world's risks for security itself.

Europe is one of the centers from which another war may start, therefore, there is an effort to move toward a European security pact. This effort is tending to divide Europe into those countries for and against Germany. In a way, therefore, there is value in the fact that the United States and Great Britain would not subscribe to such a pact. This is one explanation of the fact that Great Britain is inclined to be more sensitive to the opinion of the United States than to the opinion of Europe.

There is practically general agreement on the need for a permanent machine which would guide the inquiry of the future in regard to armaments. The question here has to do with the difficult problem of "control." France has said that she would not stand for "supervision on the spot." If Japan refuses this also, then Russia would also have to refuse. If Russia does not accept it, such countries as Poland and Roumania would naturally object. However, recent treaties between Russia and smaller adjoining states may have affected this situation.

The next great problem has to do with man-

power. The larger nations have practically accepted the suggestions of the United States on this matter. There are several difficult problems, however, on which, as yet, there is no general agreement.

Another difficult point has to do with the relative calibres of guns, especially in relationship between land and sea guns. The fact that no arrangement has yet been made in regard to naval disarmament has held up consideration of this difficult question.

A major unsolved problem has to do with armaments. Every country has registered its disfavor of air bombing. There is not yet, however, a solution of the problem having to do with the relation between civil and military aviation.

There is a real measure of agreement at Geneva in regard to budgetary limitation.

There has been an enormous advance in the intelligence and zeal of public opinion on questions before the Disarmament Commission. I believe that there have been definite gains at Geneva. Now the time is ripe for an enormous increase in the education of public opinion. It has never been so needed as now.

Social Justice as the Basis for Peace

By F. ERNEST JOHNSON

BBROADLY speaking, there are four methods of attacking war:

1. Political—the method of building up and operating the machinery of peace, including disarmament agreements.

2. Moral—the method of collective and reciprocal renunciation—outlawry of war.

3. Cultural—the method of curing animosities and conflicts by contact and cooperation in intellectual, artistic and physical achievement.

4. Socio-economic—the method of altering the material framework in which the nations live their common life, in order to remove the grounds of antagonism and destructive rivalry.

All these methods have their uses. Each offers a means of supplementing the others. The movement against war has suffered immeasurably by disproportionate emphasis on some one factor to the neglect of others. Thus the ethical approach to the question—over-stressing the significance of the efficacy of mere renunciation—created artificial hopes and a zeal that lacked effective implementation. The significance of the political and cultural approaches has been belittled by many in the interest of "realism," and the achievements of the League of Nations have been correspondingly under-estimated. On the other hand, the political and cultural attacks on war are by themselves inadequate. The peace movement has indulged in a good deal of romanticism concerning them, as current developments abundantly prove.

It is when the basic social and economic structure of modern life is examined that we come closest to the roots of war. I do not disparage the other methods, for they are important, they are essential. But when I contemplate the litera-

ture of the peace movement with its very great preoccupation with the parliamentary structure and the diplomacy of peace, I recall the scriptural admonition, "These ye ought to have done and not to leave the other undone."

We are witnessing the rapid growth of a new nationalism, autarchy, as it is sometimes called, national self-sufficiency. It runs counter to all your international ideals and mine. Yet there is a devastating inevitability about it that tends to paralyze idealistic effort. Many who deplore it are disposed to accept it as unavoidable.

The explanation is not far to seek. The industrialized nations are suffering from an economic disease, a chronic imbalance between production and consumption. In economic terms the diagnosis is a faulty distribution of purchasing power. In moral terms it is a denial of justice to the masses of mankind. We have sowed the wind and reaped the whirlwind. Our own house is in danger, we withdraw attention from our neighbors' houses. The process of recovery makes us disregard the effect of what we do upon the other nations and, likewise, the long-time consequences of that disregard upon ourselves. A juster economic order would have avoided the crisis and made unnecessary and irrelevant those policies that bring us into antagonism with our foreign neighbors.

The monetary problem is the illustration of this truth that comes readiest to mind. The greatest evil in price depression is the injustice that it works upon the debtor class—the farmers who have mortgaged their farms and the home owners who have mortgaged their homes. When the strain becomes so great that interest and taxes cease to be paid, the nation is threatened with catastrophe and every effort is made to avert it. We go "off gold" in an effort to protect our own credit structure, to stimulate foreign trade and to raise the domestic price level, little recking what damage our tail-spinning dollar may do in the markets of the world. I am not calling in question the necessity of such emergency measures, but only the system under which we normally

live which makes inevitable these cyclic depressions with their widely ramifying consequences.

We are tardily coming to recognize in America the bearing of the labor movement upon national stability and economic health. An essential element in the recovery program is the building up of a strong, responsible labor movement which will ensure a more equitable and a more economic distribution of income. Yet in spite of the clear logic of the matter, American industry yields slowly and reluctantly or not at all to the demand of the workers for the right of organization and group action. This resistance to a demand defended as socially just by our courts and legislatures and upheld by organized religion, is a definite menace to world peace.

The inclusion of the objectives of the great cause of social justice in the Treaty of Versailles, and the setting up of the permanent Labor Organization offer striking evidence that even those statesmen whose political short-sightedness we often deplore saw much more clearly than we in America the intimate relation existing between industrial justice and the peace of the world.

Today every zealous advocate of peace is bound by the logic of events to give wholehearted and vigorous support to those features of the New Deal which would bestow a new status on labor—and also, to those elements in the labor movement which possess sufficient statesmanship to make of the labor movement a more unified, more intelligent and more effective influence in our national life than it has been hitherto.

Tariff barriers are among the commonest causes of international strife. In what do they originate? In the effort of investors to gain more than the free commerce among the nations would permit. The issue, again, is one of justice—justice, which the profit motive overrides.

The race for raw materials and for markets which has had so large a part in creating the strained international structure of our society is part and parcel of a domestic economic individualism which justifies the piling up of profits at a rate that results in a top-heavy capital structure and a pyramid of debt. The counterpart of the economic struggle at home is a struggle, actual or potential, between the armed forces of the nations.

The immigration issue, which a few years ago brought us to the verge of war with a great Eastern Power, was at bottom an issue of social justice, arising out of the insistence that certain peoples are inferior to ourselves, and deserving of a lower status. Often this attitude is but a rationalization of economic self-interest. Always it is a denial of the claims of human brotherhood.

We shall never have peace among the nations until we remold our socio-economic structure in such a way as to enshrine this principle: That every human being shall have the opportunity to reach the limit of what it is in him to be, unhampered by man-made restrictions upon his life. Justice among men is a prerequisite of peace among the nations.

THE NEW EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Carrie Chapman Catt, *Honorary Chairman.*

Miss Ruth Morgan, *Administrative Chairman.*

Mrs. William Dick Sporborg, *Recording Secretary.*

Mrs. Edgerton Parsons, *Treasurer.*

Miss Josephine Schain.

Mrs. Frederic Beggs.

Miss Margaret Buttenheim.

Miss Henrietta Roelofs.

Mrs. May Bell Harper.

Mrs. Fred S. Bennett.

Miss Albert Lytle Deane.

Miss Esther G. Ogden.

Mrs. Herbert Y. McMullen.

Miss Kathryn Starbuck.

Mrs. Jonathan Steere.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Presiding: Mrs Frederic Beggs

Marathon Round Tables

MRS CATT The Marathon Round Tables are a substitute for war in that if their objective, adequate discussion of facts, can be achieved throughout this country, we shall have no war. There are two parts to the activities of the Marathon Round Tables: 1 A study course, and 2 Coming to a conclusion after learning the facts.

In the first year of the Marathon Round Tables, there were 315 throughout the country. This year there are 256, but they are better!

For the coming year a group of organizations concerned with peace are to provide the materials for the Marathon Round Tables.

MRS BEGGS Practically every state chairman reports that her groups are continuing. Round tables have been held in twenty-nine states. They report satisfaction in being guided in choice of materials and subjects, a variety of participation, discussions in communities in which there have never before been such discussions, groups in faculty clubs, among students, in neighborhoods, summer hotels, groups of foreign born and, one group each in the following: a military academy, a D A R chapter, an American Legion post.

The reports illustrate various results. Plans for reaching untouched people in a community, plans for giving youth something real to do, flexibility and new information in place of fixed opinions; new encouragement in regard to the inevitable success of peace machinery, discovery of new leaders.

A DEMONSTRATION MARATHON ROUND TABLE

MISS MARGARET BUTTENHEIM, *Leader*

SCENE: Hometown, U S A.

CAST

A RECENT DELEGATE TO THE CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR

A THOROUGHLY INFORMED GENTLEMAN

A ZEALOUS LADY WHO KNOWS HER FACTS

A FOLKSY LADY.

AN EAGER YOUNG THING

A NEW MEMBER.

A SCEPTICAL LADY

A LADY ALL FOR "ACTION."

A MEMBER OF THE COMMUNITY'S WOMEN'S TRADE UNION LEAGUE.

CHAIRMAN (*introduces the group to the audience and begins*) We have studied our assignments. Let us read over the subject in the light of the purpose of the Marathon Round Table—Enlightened Nationalism. Is isolation possible or desirable—in the economic field? in our armaments policy? from the political standpoint? Let us keep today to a more general consideration of

the topic, referring specific points under it to the next meetings. Who wants to begin?

THE FOLKSY PERSON Well, I think the idea of nationalism is good but impracticable. Can you imagine the American people getting along without electric lights? We have to go to China for them. And how about coffee?

C & C DELEGATE Wait a minute, I don't want to give up my morning coffee?

THE FOLKSY PERSON We can make arrangements with Brazil for coffee, but it isn't a simple matter. Take steel, for instance, we have to go to fifty countries to get the thirty elements that go into steel. My humble opinion, Madam Chairman, is that economic self-sufficiency breaks right down on steel.

ZEALOUS LADY Even though we did without these things for ourselves, there is another point. If we cut our imports down, the factories could not run without these products from other countries. What would happen to our own economic life?

CHAIRMAN That reminds me that we used to have trade exhibits in this town, showing that our town was dependent on these foreign products. Let's make a note, Madam Secretary, to have another trade exhibit here.

INFORMED GENTLEMAN Another point. Look at the effect of the Hawley-Smoot tariff on the farmers. Their customers in foreign lands cannot buy their products because they cannot sell us goods, and look at the state of the farmers today.

LADY FOR "ACTION" reads a statement which upholds last speaker.

ANOTHER MEMBER Have you seen the pamphlet by Lewis Lorwin, "Economic Nationalism and World Cooperation"?

CHAIRMAN Have we not now reached the point at which we can say that we think complete isolation is out of the question? Are you willing to go that far?

THE GROUP *Chorus of "Yes"*

A SCEPTICAL LADY Now take President Roosevelt. He says that we are cooperating with foreign countries, so why do any more cooperating. Isn't that enough for us to do?

ZEALOUS LADY I think we have reached a second stage in our national recovery program. Here is a recent statement of the President. (*Reads*) "I will spare no effort to re-create world trade." We are evidently at the point which the President suggests here. Certainly we must develop world trade. Secretary Wallace says that 50 million acres will grow up to weeds without it.

INFORMED GENTLEMAN But isn't there danger in competing with other countries in securing markets?

A NEW MEMBER Did you hear Mrs Roosevelt on the radio Wednesday evening? "In the past, governments have had difficulties in international relations because nations don't always say what they mean." If we are going in for

opening up our tariff walls, will we not need to have reciprocal action from foreign nations?

CHAIRMAN Suppose someone sum up the meeting's discussion so far as we have gone.

ZEALOUS LADY It seems to me that we are agreed as follows: 1 That, like it or not, we are interrelated with the rest of the world. 2 That we cannot have national prosperity without world prosperity. The difficulty is that we have to bring these two positions into harmony.

CHAIRMAN Agreed?

GROUP Yes (*FOLKSY PERSON I think so!*)

CHAIRMAN You see, we agree like lambs on generalities but we always fight on specifics.

INFORMED GENTLEMAN How can we get far on international economic cooperation if we go on with a naval policy which leads surely to war? We all of us believe in peace, but we all, actively or passively, go on supporting these policies for war. Take for instance the Kellogg Pact—

FOLKSY PERSON What is the second paragraph of the Kellogg Pact? No one ever quotes it.

INFORMED GENTLEMAN repeats second paragraph and records his understanding of the present proposals in regard to the military budget. *Group can scarcely believe these facts!*

A MEMBER Where did you find those figures?

INFORMED GENTLEMAN quotes his source.

A MEMBER I didn't see that in the papers.

A MEMBER Where are we to get accurate information? Our newspapers don't give it to us.

FOLKSY PERSON Well, you can always depend on that correspondent, Clarence Streit, and then there is Walter Duranty—he writes a little bit on Russia.

INFORMED GENTLEMAN: I am more exercised about Japan itself than propaganda about it. Do you know that the scare stories in the Japanese press come out at the same time in which their big naval bill is going to the Diet, and material in Mr. Hearst's paper builds right into our own naval program.

FOLKSY PERSON Someone told me that the munitions manufacturers have something to do with that.

C & C DELEGATE That leads into the whole question in regard to traffic in arms. Have you read that English book by Fenner Brockway, *The Bloody Traffic*? In it he makes ten specific charges. (*Reads them from book*)

YOUNG THING Well, nationalism sounds like real action to us young people.

C & C DELEGATE I wish that you had been at the Ninth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War. There was a young Yale man there, one of his suggestions was that there be a course on war in every college.

INFORMED GENTLEMAN Say, that's already being done. Raymond Buell is giving such a course at Harvard.

YOUNG THING How about the girls!

ANOTHER MEMBER Better read Vera Brittain's, *Testament of Youth*.

CHAIRMAN Let's ask someone to tell us where we started from. We have digressed a bit.

INFORMED GENTLEMAN. Let's go back to the

question of national policy We can't have an international disarmament convention, for instance, until we bring our own national policy in line with it.

CHAIRMAN finds that group agrees that we cannot have a competitive armament policy

A SCEPTICAL LADY. But how can you take away from us our army and navy?

INFORMED GENTLEMAN I said—eventually SCEPTICAL LADY Then we can still have our navy until things get better?

CHAIRMAN Perhaps a detailed discussion of armaments might come at a later meeting

INFORMED GENTLEMAN Did you know that one small cruiser costs more than the annual appropriation for the Department of State?

FOLKSY PERSON I don't think that is right LADY FOR "ACTION". I think that we can't get along without getting into the World Court

CHAIRMAN We always get to that topic Let's talk about that at another meeting Now will the secretary tell us where she thinks we have arrived on the question Isolation vs Cooperation.

SECRETARY reads summary; group nods at several points, and FOLKSY PERSON remarks, "It seems marvelous that we said all that"

CHAIRMAN finds that group agrees to summary and suggests that group decide what can be done before the next meeting Suggestions made during meeting are listed by secretary One member assigned to investigate possibility of a trade exhibit Another is to furnish names of Senate Committee on World Court. Another urges that their Senators and Representatives be interviewed Pamphlets to be read before the next meeting are noted.

THE conclusions reached by this demonstration round table are not here given. The conclusions would vary with different groups The point of this demonstration is in terms of method

Mrs. Beggs, the chairman for Marathon Round Tables, then outlined the plans for the year The subject is to be, "The Evolving Foreign Policy of the United States" It is hoped that at least 500 round tables will be organized during the year, a relatively easy goal

vision, peace with a domestic prosperity to be attained by economic warfare with other nations.

In a word, what we today describe as the failure of the League of Nations is something far different, far more profound and infinitely more disturbing

What can be the value of debating the question of the future of the League? What can be the future of a remedy which the patients will not take? What is the sense of reforming that medicine which all peoples similarly refuse to swallow?

The future of the League must be determined outside of the League itself, and has nothing whatever to do with any possible reform of the present machinery The trouble has lain—and lies—not with Geneva but with nations, which, in fact, means that it lies with peoples and with all peoples equally.

Imperfect as it is in many of its details, the League of Nations in its present form would be adequate to serve the purposes for which it was originally designed if the state of mind of peoples had remained what it was in the first months following the Armistice of 1918 But the fate of the League has been the fate of a mill established by a stream which has progressively dried up until today no water is left to turn the wheels. And, of course, the stream, the water, is public opinion in the several nations of the world.

Now it is proposed to amend the League by separating it from the peace treaties! What exactly does that mean? It means stripping it of all power and every prerogative in the matter of issues between nations which might lead to war. It means transforming it from a world congress to an international bureau.

But as to the question as to whether the League has a real future, and, if so, what the nature of that future is to be, the answer which I submit to you is that both of these interrogations must be answered not at Geneva but within the frontiers of nations. If the League is to survive, that survival will be assured not by tinkering up the existing machinery, but by producing a domestic reaction in all countries against the present spirit of intense and uncompromising nationalism which has already nearly destroyed the League and has actually brought us to the very threshold of a new war.

The Future of the League of Nations

BY ALDEN G. ALLEY

FOR centuries a great evolution has been going on in the political life of mankind—an evolution up out of anarchy into law. So vast has been the progress of this evolution that every civilized nation has ended the anarchy that once reigned in its land and has established, instead, a regime of law.

Now the nations are facing this problem: Can they do in their relations with one another, what each of them has done within its own frontiers—end anarchy and establish law? A mighty force

FRIDAY EVENING SESSION

Presiding: Mrs. Henry Grattan Doyle

Planning for a New World Society

The Future of the League of Nations

BY FRANK H. SIMONDS

DEBATE is going forward as to whether the League of Nations actually has a future at all. And, on the other hand, those who answer that question in the affirmative are busily discussing the change in the form of the League that recent events seem to have dictated

It is obvious, however, that both discussions start from the same point Both assume that something has happened to the League In the press of the world and in the public discussions one most frequently hears of the "collapse" of the League and that "collapse" is explained in the light of the alleged failure of Geneva in the case of Manchuria, of the Disarmament Conference and of the equally disastrous London Economic Conference

I shall undertake the thesis that the League has not failed and cannot fairly be described as having failed because it has never actually been employed In a word, that failure, responsibility for which is laid at the doors of Geneva, really occurred elsewhere, occurred, in fact, within those nations responsible for the creation of the League, and, in the main, members of that organization

What, after all, is the League of Nations? Of itself, it is nothing, its unique value rests in the use peoples are prepared to make of it

At the close of the World War, the Wilsonian project of an international society was hailed

by peoples everywhere, because at that moment the dominant thought in the minds of all was, "Never again!"

But while peoples everywhere were eager to avoid another war, were any prepared to pay the price of peace? It is my opinion that while no people wants war, none has any effective desire for peace. And by effective desire for peace I mean any readiness to pay in terms of curtailment of national sovereignty and abridgement of national policies for the only conceivable form of international insurance against a new war

There, as I see it, is the tragic paradox of our present era.

The League was designed to serve the ends of a world made up of peoples who were thinking internationally, who had grasped the basic fact of the World War—the fact that this struggle had its origin in the pre-war anarchy of conflicting nationalisms—and, as a consequence, were resolved at all costs and sacrifices to build up a barrier against a new catastrophe by putting an end to that old anarchy

But once this League had been created, all peoples, with one accord, undertook to employ an international machine to serve national interests or refused to make use of its machinery at all, for fear that membership in the League might compromise national policies or purposes.

So far, in the post-war period, peoples who have wanted peace have wanted peace in conformity with national programs, peace with isolation, peace with security, peace with treaty re-

is driving them toward this goal their own vital interests

Anarchy among nations has now become a deadly menace to every people in the world. It means a competition in armaments, increasing the already staggering burden of taxation, increasing national debts already appallingly great, weakening the credit of governments, taking for armaments sums needed for vital institutions such as our schools, spreading fear, suspicion, hatred among nations, weakening that confidence in the future that is essential to permanent prosperity.

Anarchy among nations means further wars, fought with weapons deadlier even than those of the World War. Again nations will assemble the finest of their young manhood, bury millions under white crosses, turn other millions into remnants of men, crippled, diseased, blinded, driven mad. Again nations will squander their savings in mutual destruction, bend their backs under gigantic debts, destroy the financial and economic foundations of the community of nations, and pass finally in another of the hideous depressions that follow great wars.

But there can be no regime of law among nations without the institutions of law—a world law making body, a world court, a world law enforcing body.

In the League of Nations and the World Court we have the beginnings of these institutions. Undeniedly, they are young, imperfect, weak. But they represent a great advance over anything the world has had before.

The conference system of the League, for example, is an enormous improvement over the isolated, unconnected conferences of the pre-League period. The League has its annual Assembly, reviewing the work of the past year and planning the work of the coming year. The Council meets at least every four months, special conferences are called for particular purposes, and an extraordinary session of Assembly or Council is always quickly possible in a crisis. This last point is of especial importance. The League has been asked four times to call a special conference in an hour critical for peace. Once it assembled the conference in nine days, once in two days, once in one day, once in seven hours.

Few people know that at least a dozen serious international disputes have been referred to the League and only two of them have resulted in war.

I do not know of a single important statesman who does not believe that the death of the League would be fatal to world peace.

It is no accident that when Japan and Germany overthrew their peace-loving governments and embarked on their present mad militarism, they both resigned from the League. It is no accident that every civilized country in the world that loves peace is strongly expressing its sympathy with the League at this time. I rejoice that President Roosevelt has, in a recent speech, spoken with special friendliness of the League and its work.

If the nations are not using the League with wisdom and high purpose, the fault lies not with the statesmen but with the people. It is they who elect the statesmen. So uninformed, apa-

thetic, prejudiced in international matters are the great mass of the voters that they elect the wrong kind of statesmen or, if they elect the right kind, fail to give him the necessary support. Although much still needs to be done in improving public opinion in this and other countries, we have made real progress in this matter during the last dozen years.

In 1933 public opinion here had so advanced that President Roosevelt could say "The League has helped labor and health and commerce and education and the actual settlement of many disputes, great and small. Today the United States is cooperating more openly in the fuller utilization of the League of Nations machinery than ever before."

If, in twelve years, we can make an advance as great as that we can give ourselves hopefully to the greatest problem of our time—to raise the level of public opinion throughout civilized nations so that the nations will be able to use international institutions wisely and justly and thus establish a real regime of law among the nations of the world.

I agree with Mr. Simonds that you have to admit that the behavior of nations will be governed by their own interests. But I do believe that nations can be made to see that their own interests can best be secured through cooperation with other nations.

QUESTIONS FROM THE FLOOR

Question Is not the League of Nations now the only way by which small countries can get consideration of their problems?

MR. SIMONDS. Yes, they have at least a place for stating their opinion even though it is not listened to.

Q Why not insert the Kellogg Pact into the Constitution of the United States?

MR. SIMONDS. The inefficiency of the Kellogg Pact lies in the fact that no country which signed it ever intended to follow it through. Your suggestion would not help.

Q Under what conditions would the United States be willing to join the League?

MR. SIMONDS. That is beyond the limits of prophecy. In making this answer it is not courage that I lack, but imagination.

MR. DE LANUX. I usually disagree with Mr. Simonds not on his facts, for they are most accurate, but on his negative conclusions from these facts. The question is: Are we going to do something about this world situation or are we not? If the American people do nothing about it, there will be war. If they do certain things about it there will not be war.

Q. If so much depends on public opinion, what can we do about the newspapers?

MR. ALLEY. Those of you who live in small towns can really make some impress on your newspapers. There should be a local peace committee in every community which could watch the press, secure space for expression of opinions and send letters counteracting war-breeding editorials.

Q. Has Mr. Alley ever lived in a small town and has he ever tried to do it?

MR. ALLEY. I was once a reporter on a newspaper in a small town and I still think this could be done.

How Civilized Are We?

DR. MORRIS L. LAZARON

WE have heard tonight some unpleasant facts about the world situation. But let me call your attention to another fact, a fact which peace lovers must never forget. Matching the will for war is the fact of the will for peace. Never have men and women longed for and dreamed of peace as today. We recall Schiller's picture of the Angel who offered in one hand truth, and in the other hand the search for truth, "Give me the search for truth, for truth is for God alone," said Man. We may not have peace in our grasp, but we have before us the long search for peace.

There is another thing which must be brought to your attention. Now is the time to resolve not to be swept off our feet in time of war, to determine not to yield at such a time to the propaganda of special interests, to cultivate that habit of mind that shall give us strength to say, "Knowing God's mind, it shall not be done."

I believe profoundly that it is the ambition and greed of corrupt groups as well as the indifference of men and women that make war. Wars are economic in their roots. If we remove the economic causes of war, we shall have to fight for a better social order; as long as it is possible to accumulate millions in wealth, there will be war. Unemployment, injustice—how easy it would be to divert the discontent of the people by clothing the whole thing in the panoply of war.

You and I must not be found asleep for our objective is the hope of the dreamers of all mankind. There is no armistice in the battle for peace. May God strengthen you and bless you and prosper the work of your hands.

Mrs. Catt

MANY years ago when an editorial appeared in a metropolitan newspaper asserting that the suffrage cause would never win, a lady told me that I ought to answer the editorial. But I thought that even though we only added an inch a year, by and by, it would be miles. So I never answered the editorial.

It is very difficult to change the thinking of the world. There may be a next war, but do not say that peace is lost. No power on earth can stop peace. We who stand for peace, must be content with inching forward. The suffrage cause took seventy-two years of organized effort for its achieving and it was unorganized for fifty years before that. You cannot substitute one idea for another in anything less than one hundred years. You have to enlist for your lives in this peace cause, but you will have your greatest comfort in noting how stupid other folks are. It takes two sides to make a controversy and you have to have a controversy in order to make converts. It is a long way to real civilization but we are going to see a great triumph some day.

Declarations of the Ninth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War

Washington, D. C., January 16-19, 1934

Recommended by the National Committee and adopted unanimously, the delegates voting as individuals. These declarations are to be presented to the President of the United States and to the Congress.

THE eleven national women's organizations united to compose the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War number in individual membership several millions. There is scarcely a village or crossroads in this country which does not contain a local branch of one or more of these organizations. During the past nine years, through annual national conferences, regional or state conferences, reading courses and Marathon Round Tables, these women have made continual effort to ascertain the causes and to find the definite cures of war, with the result that the following policies, most of which have been endorsed many times previously, have been unanimously confirmed by the delegated body assembled in the Ninth Conference now in session (January 16-19, 1934).

REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS

The National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War sent a delegation with hundreds of resolutions to the London conference aiming at naval reduction. It sent another delegation with petitions from every state in the nation to the opening of the Disarmament Conference. That body has been slow and hesitating. Nevertheless, in the words of our Secretary of State, Hon Cordell Hull, "We cannot permit the obstacles and difficulties facing the Disarmament Conference to discourage us from efforts toward bringing it to a successful conclusion." Therefore we entreat our President and the Congress to continue the friendly and earnest cooperation which has distinguished the previous action of our nation, in urging the conference to provide for a substantial reduction of existing armaments, and especially for the elimination from all national military equipment of those aggressive weapons which are regarded as needful in offensive attack. We urge that the allied nations fulfill their promise of progressive reduction of armament, in order that no rearmament may become necessary to any nation. Further, the treaty to be formulated by the conference and submitted to all nations for ratification shall include plans for enforcing the above provisions and for carrying forward the work of the disarmament conference.

INQUIRY INTO THE METHODS OF CONTROL OF ARMS

We earnestly request the President and the Congress to appeal to the League of Nations to continue the investigation of the manufacture and sale of all varieties of armaments, and to recommend and publish to all nations methods for their effective control. We urge our own Congress to conduct such investigation in our own country and to find the means of preventing sales and exports, directly or indirectly, to nations at war or threatening war.

WORLD COURT

Adherence to the Permanent Court of International Justice has been an outstanding issue in this country since 1925. It is doubtful if any question has been more generally espoused by public opinion than has the desire to see the United States a member of the World Court. A majority, at least, of the newspapers of the United States have editorially endorsed the World Court and this they continue to do from time to time. The most important organizations in the United States representing large or an exceptional character of membership have recorded themselves as being favorable to the adherence to the World Court. Among these are the American Bar Association and twenty-three state bar associations—Arkansas, Connecticut, Minnesota, New York, West Virginia, Rhode Island, Montana, Washington, South Dakota, Nebraska, Virginia, Vermont, Missouri, Ohio, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Jersey, New Hampshire, Kentucky, North Dakota, Idaho, Oregon, Texas, and the United States Chamber of Commerce and, among others, Chambers of Commerce in San Francisco, Pennsylvania (State Chamber), Philadelphia, Providence, Charleston, W. Va., New York (State Chamber), Spokane, Scranton, Los Angeles, have endorsed the World Court. The American Federation of Labor, the Federal Council of Churches, State Departments of the American Legion in at least seven states, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Education Association, the eleven organizations composing the membership of the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, and many more, have heartily endorsed the World Court and have entreated the Senate to take the necessary steps to secure the official participation of the United States in that body.

We have heard it said that popular opinion is not now as earnest for the World Court as it was a few years ago, but in 1932 both dominant political parties adopted a definite program favoring the adherence of the United States to the World Court, and in the year 1933 the State Legislatures of Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Iowa, Nevada, Maryland, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Vermont urged early action on admission to the World Court.

We therefore beg the President of the United States to urge early and favorable action upon the United States Senate. Such evidence of positive approval of international peace would stimulate the faith of the entire world and be a recognition of the continuing public opinion which exists in this country for the World Court.

LATIN AMERICA

We are gratified by the endeavors of the Administration, the Secretary of State, and the Commission to the Pan American Union Conference at Montevideo, in furthering goodwill, better understanding, and actual plans for peace in the Western Hemisphere, and it is our earnest hope that those efforts will ultimately establish peace between Bolivia and Paraguay. We are further gratified by the assurance of the President in his Woodrow Wilson Foundation dinner address that he does not favor armed intervention by the United States in any Latin American country. With this expression of policy the delegates to the Ninth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War heartily coincide.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

We express our grateful appreciation of the friendly cooperation of our nation with the League of Nations and hope for its continuance. We earnestly urge Congress to consider what amendments, if any, to the Covenant would provide satisfactory conditions for the entrance of the United States into membership.

Further, we recommend that our members study carefully and point out any amendments to the Covenant which should be recommended to the government of the United States.

WHO'S WHO

ALLEY, ALDEN G., Field Lecturer, National Council for the Prevention of War
CLARK, GROVER, Lecturer, Columbia University, formerly editor *Pekin Leader*
EZEKIEL, MORDECAI, Economic Adviser of the Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture
HORNBECK, STANLEY K., Chief of Division of Far Eastern Affairs, United States Department of State
JOHNSON, F. ERNEST, Department of Education and Research, Federal Council of Churches
JOHNSTONE, WILLIAM CRANE, JR., School of Government, George Washington University
DE LANUX, PIERRE, Director, Paris Office, League of Nations, Author and Lecturer.
LAZARON, DR. MORRIS, Baltimore, Maryland
PASVOLSKY, LEO, Staff Member of Brookings Institution
SIMONDS, FRANK H., Author and Lecturer.

Resources

This bibliography on disarmament was suggested in one discussion group:

Cry Havoc, by Beverly Nichols.
Merchants of Death, by H. C. Englebrecht.
International Traffic in Arms and Munitions, by William H. Stone, Foreign Policy Association
Mystery Man of Europe (Basil Zaharoff), by Richard Lewinsohn.
Bloody Traffic, by A. Fenner Brockway.
Salemen of Death (Canadian).

PROTEST ON NAVY

In the session of Friday afternoon a resolution was adopted by the delegates, voting as individuals, recording a protest on the proposal that our nation spend \$238 million in building up the navy to treaty limits. The resolution declares the plan to be utterly inconsistent with the policies of our nation at Geneva, and likely to prove mischievous to the welfare of the entire world.

EXTRA COPIES

IF you wish to have the complete address of Dr. F. Ernest Johnson (Friday Morning Session), order by post card and a bill covering costs will be sent with the copies. Address the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, 1622 Grand Central Terminal Building, 70 East 45th Street, New York.

Information on and extra copies of the *Delegate's Worksheet* may be secured from the same address.

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

TENTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR, HALL OF NATIONS, HOTEL WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 22 TO JANUARY 25, 1935, INCLUSIVE

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

NO. 1

TUESDAY MORNING SESSION

Presiding: Josephine Schain

THE WORLD TODAY

By FELIX MORLEY

I WAS much amused at a cartoon in Punch showing Adam and Eve leaving the Garden of Eden and facing a desert waste ahead. "My dear," said one to the other, "I fear that we are entering a period of transition." The human race is always either entering, leaving or within a period of transition; this is true both for nations and for individuals.

The year 1933 could be said to have been a deflation period in international relations; the world peace system seemed to be breaking down. In March of that year Japan withdrew from the League of Nations and in the autumn Germany also withdrew. Those two actions threatened the collapse of the collective system on which nations had worked since the end of the war.

In the year 1934 the world began to move up in the direction of rational international relations. Russia joined the League of Nations. A week ago a plebiscite was held in the Saar, significant not only for its results but because it was illustrative of a kind of international cooperation by which other problems in a technical field can be tackled.

The Saar Plebiscite was significant also because it brought to an end one of the important activities of the League of Nations. Dr. Rapard has analyzed the League of Nations as three Leagues in one: 1. A League to carry out the peace treaties. 2. A League for international cooperation. 3. A League for the prevention of war. He points out that of these three functions, the least important one, in a long-range viewpoint, is the first, the carrying out of the peace treaties. So we may rejoice that with the completion of the Saar Plebiscite the League of Nations can center its attention upon international cooperation and the prevention of war. It may not be too rash a prophecy to say that we shall now see a movement toward Germany's reentrance to the League of Nations; this may come about prior to the expiration of the two years which elapse between the announcement of withdrawal and the actual fact. I do not anticipate, however, that Japan will reënter the League within her two-year period.

The year 1934 has brought steady steps on the part of the United States toward closer re-

PRESENTATION OF PROGRAM: Mrs. Kendall Emerson

In presenting this program the committee wishes to express the hope that it may not only be of interest to every individual delegate, but that out of it may come very practical aid and stimulus to the eleven participating organizations in pursuing a more united and effective policy of activity for the achievement of our objective. To that end we urge the importance of the general theme, the Price of Peace.

Will you note particularly the careful procedures which have been set up for arriving at a consensus as to what shall be the program for next year which this conference will recommend to the eleven participating organizations?

relationship with the League of Nations. In joining the International Labor Office, constitutionally a technical arm of the League of Nations, the administration of our government has indicated that membership in the I.L.O. in no way implies relationship to the League of Nations, yet it can be said that this action broke the resistance within the United States to the League of Nations. Some pockets of resistance still remain; one of these waves of opposition is demonstrated in certain resistance to adhesion to the World Court. Some of these reservations which are proposed in regard to our entrance to the World Court seem to be superfluous. They demonstrate, however, that the United States is taking seriously the question of relationship to collective machinery for peace. The League of Nations has had too many fair weather members. It is significant that the United States moves toward closer relationship with the League of Nations with thoughtful consideration of all that is involved both for each nation concerned and for civilization.

One might note some more specific advances in 1934:

1. There has been better meshing of the gears in international machinery. In 1931, when Japan occupied Manchuria, there could be said to be three separate peace systems:
 - (a) The system of the League of Nations.
 - (b) The system of the United States, illustrated by the Paris Pact.
 - (c) The system of Soviet Russia.

Miss Ruth Morgan

AS WE gather for our Tenth Anniversary Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, a presence is missing in our midst. Ruth Morgan is not with us. At every one of the previous conferences she has been among us, directing, aiding, inspiring.

To her the conquest of peace was high emprise. For years she has brought to it all the rich and varied resources of her personality and her gifts, her brilliant mind, her creative imagination, her wit, her generosity, her tireless devotion, her unsleeping loyalty, her practical sense, all warmed by humor, steadied by faith.

To her the cure of war was the great adventure, a holy cause in the service of her Master, the Prince of Peace. We of the Tenth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War are grateful for Ruth Morgan; we cherish her memory; many of us possess some precious fragment of remembrance of that gracious spirit.

Today Ruth Morgan is with us. Like those elder warriors, she is "absent, accounted for, among the heroes." We recognize her in that "cloud of witnesses," those immortal presences in our mortal midst, who share our labors, inspire our zeal, and make certain the final beatitude of the "peacemakers who shall be called the children of God."

These three systems were all within the rather vague peace machinery of the world, but there was no meshing of these three systems. Russia was out of the League of Nations and was not recognized diplomatically by the United States; the United States was not in the League of Nations. Japanese policy wove in and out of these three gaps between the League and Russia, between Russia and the United States, and between the United States and the League of Nations.

In 1934 these gears have been tightened up. Russia has joined the League of Nations. The United States has recognized Russia, and is now moving toward closer cooperation with the League of Nations.

2 The year 1934 has brought advance in the maintenance of controls even in crises when the peace machinery was severely threatened. In each one of the assassinations of national leaders in the past year, a world conflagration could

have been brought on But the controls have held.

3. The year 1934 has brought progress in that certain powers of the peace machine have been utilized which had never before been operated This is illustrated by the peaceful event of the Saar Plebescite and by the fact that a near crash between Hungary and Yugoslavia has been averted.

From a political point of view one of the most significant events of the past year was Japan's denunciation of the Naval Treaty; yet it is not necessary to regard this as a final danger to the peace machinery or as a sure prelude to war We may well consider, for instance, that there may be something undesirable in a stereotyped ratio in a naval agreement. This denunciation, however, has brought our policy in Asia to a crossroads There are at least three possible ways of deciding our policy 1 We could team up with Great Britain in something vaguely resembling an alliance This is not very likely because, traditionally, we usually invoke George Washington's warning against "entangling alliances." 2 We could go it alone, preparing in advance for an inevitable head-on collision with Japan Most Americans would repudiate this way out, for it involves a naval race For the military staff this is the easiest

policy. The diplomatic policy must have for this situation, as clear out an objective as that of the military staff 3. We could join the League of Nations. Our anxiety in the case of Japan is the fear of acts of aggression; therefore, the sensible, diplomatic policy would move toward a general combination with other powers with the same interests as ours

1934 brought a bad set-back to our hopes for disarmament, largely because our anticipations in regard to the Disarmament Conference were too great. Yet this same year, 1934, brought a notable advance in the proposal of the Draft Convention for the Control of Traffic in Arms, proposed by our own nation. This is, perhaps, one of the most significant steps ever taken by our government in the field of international relations.

As you consider the theme of your conference, the price of peace, remember that you must sacrifice emotionalism on one hand, and extreme nationalism on the other hand, if you are to help to build international machinery

I am as critical as is anyone in regard to the League of Nations, but as I consider the world today, I am convinced that the price of peace is that adaptation of our traditions which will be involved in our joining the League of Nations.

Moscow A very distinguished speaker, filling a vacancy at the last moment and speaking extemporaneously, very mildly criticised our government, whereupon blocks of delegates privately announced their intention of going home I believe that some did go, never to return Certainly some of the presidents of the organizations were kept busy placating delegates who did not like the conference nor anything that any speaker had said Our conference was followed by another woman's meeting addressed by military men favoring war and impolitely condemning our conference We felt hostility everywhere about us.

When all was over, we were not quite certain whether our first conference had been a comedy, a tragedy or an experiment It turned out that it had been a brave beginning.

We gave the following three reasons for calling that conference.

1. "The futility of war as a means of settling difficulties between nations becomes increasingly apparent and science is demonstrating the danger of destroying our civilization by the character of modern warfare." We have traveled far from that aim 2 Most women's organizations have worked steadily through their respective programs for the improvement and uplift of an ordered human society, and they now fear that the effects of war will not only destroy what they have achieved, but also prevent the success of the next steps on their programs. I have not heard of that aim since 1925. 3. We announced further that the conference aimed to give an unbiased presentation of accurate data which would insure more effective programs of work to these organizations Long ago we forgot the programs which had been the real cause of the first conference This is all that we said about our aims at that date

The program of the 1925 conference was a study of the probable causes and possible cures of war. Two bold and remarkable addresses opened the conference One was given by Brigadier General the Right Hon Lord Thompson, former Secretary of State for Air in the British Cabinet His subject war. "Can Civilization Withstand Another World War." He had been a professional soldier for 26 years and had served in five wars Said he "The lesson of that war makes one realize the futility of force" He pointed out that France and England were unprepared while the Central Powers, ruled by autocrats, armed to the teeth, with compulsory military service, and employing every weapon of offense and defense that human ingenuity had devised, were conquered and the unprepared nations had won. "Who can overlook that lesson?" he asked.

The other great speech was given by Major General John T. O'Ryan on "Can War Be Abolished?" Said he "Of course war can be abolished, and in the lifetime of this generation The common sense of that problem will appear to you when you reflect that while we have had wars from the beginning, we have had them because the world has always been organized for war."

TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Presiding: Mrs. Geline McDonald Bowman

A Survey of the Decade from 1925-1935 in Relation to the National Conferences on the Cause and Cure of War

In Commemoration of the Tenth Anniversary

By CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

THE conversations leading to the first Conference on the Cause and Cure of War were held in 1924. Several men and women, appearing to know or to think that they knew a great deal about peace and war, were finding many opportunities to speak before women's audiences They told these audiences what to think and how to act Consequently, petitions, letters to senators upholding very many separate proposals for peace followed; yet shortly the proposals were discarded as impractical by the speakers and were rejected by the women.

The situation became more wildly bewildering and conflicting to press and public day after day War was threatening the world over Every one was nervous with apprehension Nations were unmistakably engaged in a competition of armament and were building war ships, fleets of airplanes, manufacturing new varieties of guns and arms, and drilling vast armies, under conscription, in many lands. More money was

being paid out for the maintenance of war preparation than before the World War. This was in 1924, just ten years after the war had begun.

Finally, members of the chief women's national organizations timidly asked each other whether it might not prove profitable to hold a conference and find out from those who undoubtedly knew what really caused war and what would cure it We knew that we did not know, but we had faith that master minds existed which could point out the definite cause and the certain cure of war, and that we might learn the truth from them and proceed in accordance

So, in January 1925, we held our first conference The early announcement was not hospitably received. Our entire nation was shocked and nervous Speakers hesitated to accept our invitations. Fully half our program was not supplied with speakers a few days before the conference opened Delegates and organizations were unacquainted were shy and distrustful of each other Speakers were a bit afraid of their audience and the delegates were prepared to be shocked by expected wild utterances whenever a new speaker came upon the platform. Congress clearly viewed us with suspicion and military groups outspokenly pronounced us a menace. Later it was whispered that our meeting had received money for its expenses from

A Committee on Findings, consisting of 29 women, labored hard and late at night to develop a report. The Main Committee was divided into two parts, one on Causes with Mrs. E. H. Silverthorne, chairman, and one on Cures with Mrs. John Ferguson, chairman. In the latter group I noted with interest that Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt served.

Two hundred and fifty-seven causes, actually recorded as those of historic wars, had been reported. The Committee on Causes separated all modern causes into four divisions with 42 sub-causes any one of which might bring another war. The Committee on Cures recommended the support of the Outlawry of War, then under discussion, the adherence of the United States to the Permanent Court of International Justice, the addition of an Under-Secretary of State for Peace in the Cabinet, and the reduction of armaments.

As I reread all the speeches, reports and findings of that first conference, I was deeply impressed with its fundamental greatness at the time it was held. I do not wonder that it frightened the uninformed.

If I have made no mistakes in counting, 270 men and women have accepted our invitation to speak at one or more of the ten conferences held, including this one. Some outstanding speakers have spoken several times, such as Prof. Patterson of the University of Pennsylvania, Stephen Duggan, General O'Ryan, Prof. Shotwell, and others. James G. McDonald may be called the Dean of our speakers, since he has taken part in eight of the ten conferences. After assigning one speech only to a speaker and also subtracting speeches made by our own members, I find that 175 persons, outside of our own membership, have spoken upon our programs and that the number of subjects presented has been about 200. Among our speakers have been generals, admirals, senators, representatives, cabinet ministers, business men, university presidents and professors from ten or more universities.

Representatives of 15 countries, other than our own, namely, Great Britain, Canada, South Africa, Australia, France, Holland, Germany, Italy, Spain, Russia, China, Japan, India, Mexico and the Philippines, have appeared upon our program. Every important "sore spot" threatening war has also had its place upon our program. In such controversial questions, whenever possible, both or more sides have been presented.

In the beginning, we set ourselves the rule to omit emotion, sentimentality and superficiality. I believe that we have carried out that determination. We have not always been able to get the speaker whom we believed to be best fitted to present a subject. We have sometimes secured such a speaker and he disappointed us by giving evidence that he knew less than we had supposed. In other instances, subjects of fundamental importance were placed upon the program and were reluctantly canceled because no person could be found equipped to discuss

them. For instance, we tried to bring to your attention the problem of munitions long before we did, but could find no one prepared to discuss it. Nevertheless, among the speeches made upon this platform there have been some so bold and clear thinking that they deserve to be called immortal. They will be worth reading long after the last of us who heard them are laid away. I mention only one more of the immortal ones, that of General Tasker H. Bliss in the year 1926, the subject being "The Foundation of Peace." His was a great, far-seeing soul.

In no other way have we contributed more to our self-education than in the discussions set forth in our Round Tables and Forums of which many varieties have been invented and tried.

Four times an interrogation in some form has raised the question whether actual results have followed our efforts. The answers we gave to our own questions indicate that we were satisfied. Others might accuse us of being prejudiced on our own behalf. In truth, our programs have led us as far forward as the preparation of speakers would allow. There are phases of the question of peace vs. war that no human being can now discuss with intelligence.

In 1925, our aim was stated as an intention to study the causes and the cures of war. After five years of such study, in 1931, we restated our aim in a more decided and definite form, and since that date it has stood in a printer's box at the head of our program.

GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR

- 1 To build effective peace machinery
- 2 To reduce war machinery.
- 3 To obtain guaranteed security against war for every nation

These are aims for work to be done. We might now add to or preface these aims by a statement of our changed beliefs. In the past five years we have added something to our knowledge of the causes of war.

Our efforts at education have not been confined to the delegates who come once a year. They have carried the reports of the conference to many gatherings, conferences and conventions. A Reading Course has amplified the Washington program, and the Marathon Round Tables have climaxed both. At this date 437 Marathons exist, or we may say that about 4,500 women, as a minimum, are learning by this method the facts and the meaning of our evolving foreign policy. Mrs. Frederic Beggs, chairman of the Marathons, and Miss Margaret Buttenheim, chairman of the Reading Course, have worked together to produce this excellent result. We could pronounce no praise of their intelligent and hard-working devotion which is not well deserved. This conference will be followed by a series of ten Regional Conferences* in commem-

oration of the Tenth Anniversary, by which our educational work, it is hoped, will find its way to win new adherents in all the 48 states. There will be a Marathon Round Table on each program. Mrs. Beggs or Miss Buttenheim, or both, will be there to lead them. Miss Schain, also, will be present at all the conferences.

On this Tenth Anniversary we also add to our educational efforts a book, containing ten chapters written by ten women, entitled, *Why Wars Must Cease*†.

These we have brought to sell, not to make money, but to distribute ideas. On the whole, while we may regret that our record has not been longer, I believe that we may justly feel content that our educational efforts have contributed substantially to the general clarification of the discussion of peace vs. war.

Although our original purpose was education, we were soon obliged to do active work in behalf of our aim.

We have reaffirmed our support of the World Court at each conference and have presented our resolution to four Presidents. Three of them have added their own support to ours in speeches made to our delegates at the White House. We joined in a hearing on the World Court last spring which was the most complete presentation of a cause that I have known.

A considerable campaign for the World Court has been made by these organizations separately and in conjunction with other organizations. I recommend a visit to your senators for the primary purpose of taking to them our Tenth Resolution, either urging action or thanking them for action taken. You might also present the ten years' record on the Court that you found in your envelope, and you might complete your call with a probing inquiry into the cause of ten years' delay of the admission of this country into the membership of the Court.

The Naval Reduction Conference was held in London in 1930. That year an outstanding event at our conference was the reception of women visitors from Germany, France, England and Japan. At the earlier Naval Reduction Conference, held in Washington, a Japanese woman, said to be 90 years old, brought petitions from the women of Japan. Now Mrs. Gauntlett and Miss Hayashi were on their way to London with petitions urging permanent peace, signed by a million women. They brought a message to us from Prince Tokagawa and a letter from Viscount Shibusawa, a man of 90. With tears in his eyes, he had said to those women: "Women, do not think that you can make any success at this meeting. You must be patient. I have lived for 90 years and I have not been able to carry out the things I have intended to do, but remember that if you start your work now, after generations will take up your work and finish it for you."

Mrs. Parsons, Miss Schain and Mrs. Whitney carried to London over 28,000 resolutions, representing some 300,000 persons.

In the year 1931, a research investigator, Mrs.

* See schedule in a later bulletin.
† Price, \$1.00.

Rachel Nason was appointed and went to Europe to make a study of the Polish Corridor, the sorest of all "sore spots" at the time. She reported to us at the Conference of 1932. Neither Mrs. Nason nor our conference have effected a cure. The Corridor is still "sore."

The proposal for a Multilateral Treaty, or the Kellogg Pact, called for an extension of our headquarters and extra office help. On the morning of January 29th, in the year 1929, the delegates climbed old Capitol Hill and presented to the senators the evidences that under the auspices of the combined organizations composing the Cause and Cure of War Committee, 12,000 meetings had been held on behalf of the Pact, some large, some small. In the afternoon the measure passed. We claimed as much credit for this speedy effect as our consciences allowed.

Then came the Disarmament Conference, and petitions were authorized. When Mrs. Hooper, Mrs. Fradkin, Mrs. Tuttle and Mrs. Bidler went to Geneva as our representatives, they took with them something more than 618,000 signatures. These, added to those obtained by the International League for Peace and Freedom, made a total of 1,350,000 signatures for the United States. Those efforts to obtain practical ends were all modest but worth while. We might have done better than we did, but had we done nothing it would have been lamentable.

Threats of coming war have been continuous during the past decade. No moment has been free from them. Every nation has suffered from the losses of the last war, the apprehensions of the next war, and has borne the unhappy present burden of a financial catastrophe more disastrous than any that the world has known. Millions of men and women have seen their savings of a lifetime swept away. Millions have been jobless for years. Mortgages on homes, factories and businesses have been foreclosed. Banks have failed and the morale, on which all nations commented during the war, has disappeared at times behind the horizon like a setting sun. Hospitals are full, while doctors are unemployed; suicides and insanity have increased, and crime, more brutal than ever before, prevails. This is not the price of peace, but of war. The oldest of the old have never seen so unhappy a period. It has not been a fitting decade for progress in peace making. The next decade will be better if the threats of war recede; it may be worse if war comes. In either event, it will offer opportunity to discover the real cause or causes of war, to ask why the idea of war is tolerated when the terrible price to be paid is so well known. We know today that the 42 possible causes of future wars, recorded in our findings of 1925, are no longer considered real causes, rather, they are pretexts for war. Recently, I tried an experiment and sent a questionnaire to 50 people in an effort to learn what they regarded as the real cause of war. All were well read on the subject of war. There was unity on some phases, but not on all. I recommend that at the next conference another fundamental study of causes be made. If we cannot unite on

GROUP DISCUSSIONS

What Shall Be Our Recommended Program for the Coming Year?

The conference delegates divided into five groups:

- GROUP I. The conduct of the foreign policy of the United States
Leader: Mrs. H. Y. McMullen
Recorder: Miss Elizabeth L. Fackl
- GROUP II. Building effective peace machinery
Leader: Mrs. William C. Johnstone, Jr.
Recorder: Miss Lucy Frances Cooper
- GROUP III. Reducing war machinery
Leader: Miss Myra Smith
Recorder: Mrs. Leslie Creighton
- GROUP IV. Economic agreements in the interest of peace
Leader: Mrs. Florence Brewer Boeckel
Recorder: Dr. Esther Caulkin Brunauer
- GROUP V. Democratic processes in relation to peace
Leader: Miss Elinor K. Purves
Recorder: Miss Ruth Woodsmall

Recommendations from the groups will be read to the conference on Friday morning. In the afternoon of that day there will be a forum for the entire conference, when, in the light of the addresses of the two intervening days, the delegates will have the opportunity for revision and amendment before the recommendations are adopted.

Any program adopted at this conference must be in the nature of recommendations to the eleven participating organizations, since conference action is not binding on any organization.

the causes of war, we shall not unite on the cures.

Aggression and defense may each be interpreted to mean the other. Patriotism, that reverential love of home, flag and country, is flaunted to cover the sordid fact that young men must kill other young men in its name. There is no book on defense that reveals the truth; a book that will clearly define when defense is defense and when it is aggression is needed. Apparently, no one yet knows the facts clearly enough to write that book, but before another ten years it will be done. Had we a clear and united understanding of the causes of wars and did we know the true definition of defense and patriotism, the peace vs war controversy would move forward with more clarity and speed. Personally, at this moment, my own view is that the chief cause of the maintenance of the war machine is the hereditary acceptance of the war machine as a policy, real disputes between nations are used to hide the actual cause. Certainly, our task is not completed and it will not be until we know positively the cause of war and the straight road to peace.

In closing, let me tell you an old story again.

Resolution on World Court

Whereas each one of the eleven national organizations comprising the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War has supported the proposal of American membership in the Permanent Court of International Justice, and Whereas both dominant political parties have endorsed this action, and a wide expression of popular opinion has indicated general advocacy by the people of the United States.

THEREFORE, be it resolved that the delegates to the Tenth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War urge that the Senate without further delay advise and consent to the adherence by the United States to the protocols of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Carrie Chapman Catt
Josephine Schain

January 22, 1935

AS a part of the plan to bring to the attention of the Senate the conviction of the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War in regard to the desirability of the admission of the United States to the World Court, delegations from the various states are calling on their senators. On the first day, delegates from eight states, numbering about 200 went to the Senate and were cordially received by their own senators. In almost every instance, encouragement was given to the delegates to hope for speedy and favorable action.

In the afternoon, Senator Robinson, majority leader of the Senate, received Mrs. Catt and about 50 leaders including members of the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War in the Foreign Relations Committee Room of the Senate. Mrs. Catt presented the resolution which had been passed by the conference only one-half hour before, and gave a short history of the consistent and patient work which had been done by the organizations for the past ten years. Mrs. Catt asked whether we could hope for a vote this week. Senator Robinson was very encouraging in his reply and said that he thought that there was no reason why a vote could not be taken as early as Thursday or Friday. In reply to Mrs. Catt's address, the Senator spoke for about 15 minutes, expressing his deep appreciation of the work which the women's organizations had done and his understanding of the intelligent interest which women have in the cause of peace. At the close of the interview, Senator Robinson offered to call in his secretary who would escort the group to the private balcony in the Senate, for the debate on the World Court was then in progress. The resolution on the World Court of the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War was read into the record at the close of the session of the Senate.

State delegations will continue to call on their Senators throughout the week.

When General Joffre died, this tale appeared in the press. When the French Army was about to enter its first battle under his direction, he made a speech to his men, "Let no man forget," said he, "that when he enters a battle it is too late to look backward—he can only go forward." Let me remind you that it is so with movements. The study of the Cause and Cure of War cannot look backward. It has not completed its tasks; it must go forward.

An abstract of Stephen P. Duggan's address at the Tuesday Afternoon Session will appear in Bulletin 11.

Who's Who

FELIX MORLEY is editor of the *Washington Post*.

Information and extra copies of the *Delegate's Worksheet* may be secured from the NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR, Headquarters, 1624 Grand Central Terminal Building, New York City.

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

TENTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR, HALL OF NATIONS, HOTEL WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 22 TO JANUARY 25, 1935, INCLUSIVE

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

NO. 2

TUESDAY EVENING SESSION—BANQUET

Presiding: Carrie Chapman Catt

THE OUTLOOK FOR PEACE

By MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

IT seems to me that we are gradually getting nearer to the things which may really affect the peace of the world. We are learning much in these days. We are learning that greed has always had a great deal to do with war. It will help us to prevent war in the future if we make it unprofitable for anyone when a war occurs. War never has been very profitable for the man in the trenches, but it has been profitable for others in the past, and I think that that is something which we and other nations may well accept as one of the first steps toward doing away with war.

It looks to me as though we were about to take another step in this country, and I hope—and I think the majority of women throughout the country hope—that we shall join the World Court. We know well the arguments against our joining, and some of them are good arguments; but I feel strongly that this is a gesture which we can make just now to the world, and I think we are in so little danger of being entangled against our will that we can afford to take the risk. It is interesting that we are so cautious about this move. As a rule, we rather like to do the adventurous; and to adventure in a gesture for peace makes an appeal to the women of the country.

We have to feel a thing, and I believe that we shall get peace when the women of this country and of every country feel strongly enough that they want peace. A woman's will is the strongest thing in the world, and when we firmly decide that we mean to do a thing, I am quite sure that we can do it.

Now I am not visionary. I know that we cannot do the thing all alone; that is why I said "the women of this country and the women of other countries." We can have a tremendous influence on the women of other countries. We are, I think, in the enviable position of being the women that many other women in many other countries are watching today.

I was talking to a man the other night who pointed out some interesting things about the outlook for peace or war on the continents of

the world. Of the five continents, one, Australia and New Zealand, are possessions; they can be counted out of the picture. The continent of Africa is almost entirely owned by other countries, Abyssinia is the only independent country there, and that is not threatening war at present, so we can count that country out. Then there are the Americas; there is a war in South America, but it is between two nations; it is localized. On the whole, the continent has developed a far more peaceful and neighborly feeling in the past few years, and I think that we can feel that there is no danger on this continent of a general conflagration.

We are then left with two continents, Europe and Asia, and the eyes of the women of the world must turn to those two continents; we must be thinking and watching everything that happens there. The one great danger is the desire of any one nation to possess more territory. That is the thing that we must watch, because that is, perhaps, the moving reason for war in either of these two continents.

Now, what can we women do, as we look at the possibility of nearing our ideal, eliminating the causes of war? We can be courteous to other nations and to the inhabitants of other nations, and try to make our people as a whole understand that every nation has pride just as we have pride; the first step toward understanding and good feeling is courtesy between nations. We cannot say to another nation, "We do not trust you"; we cannot say, "We think your motives are this or that," without making that nation feel resentful as we would feel resentful. And I think that we could have some influence on the press, which occasionally forgets that there are newspapers which repeat unfortunate things beyond our own borders, just as the radio carries things beyond our own borders and makes for bad feeling.

We women who have intuition, who have tact, who are accustomed to using thoughtfulness for others in the daily affairs of life, should transfer that skill to a larger field and see if we cannot bring about a better understanding in our own nation in regard to the troubles of other nations, and the things that they are up against. We can set our own house in order and remove the

troubles that we have at home which tend for differences of opinion amongst ourselves, realizing that that same thing may be going on in other countries and that therefore we must show the same consideration and understanding to them that we hope they will show to us.

The most hopeful thing for peace is the attitude of youth. While I think that many of them would be carried away by the sound of a band and of marching feet, they do honestly believe that war is an unsatisfactory way of settling difficulties, they do not feel that the wars of the past have solved or settled things that they were fought to settle. I have talked with many, many groups of young people, and, while they have varying ideas as to what the duty of young people may be if their country goes to war, there is a growing sentiment among them that war is a stupid way of trying to solve international difficulties. That attitude, to me, is one of the most hopeful signs for peace in the future.

Another hopeful sign is a growing realization that the one great thing which gives us a lift and which welds a nation together and makes a nation able to do more than it can in ordinary times, is devotion to some ideal. That is the one good thing that has come from war in the past after a period of peace which so often breeds many things that are bad—selfishness, greed, interest in purely material things—war develops that curious devotion to a cause which gives the country and its people the lift that it needs, and satisfies a craving that lies in every heart, the craving for devotion to some cause. The reason we have not been able to have peace in the world is that we have not been able to secure from the people of the world a sufficient devotion to a cause to make them rise above the things which lead us into war.

Perhaps the day is dawning when our nation, and other nations, will find that we can give our devotion to another cause. That is for you to decide; that is for this country as a whole to decide—and for other countries, too. We are living at a critical time and our decision must be made as to whether we shall go down with the material things or whether we shall advance with devotion to the cause of humanity. When that decision is made, then, I believe, wars will cease.

The address given by Robt. Mann at the banquet is printed on page 10 of the insert.

WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

Presiding: Mrs. Kendall Emerson

"CONVERSATION PIECE": THE NEW DANGERS OF WAR

The Danger of Our Neutrality Doctrine

By HARRY GIDEONSE

THERE is something of irony in my present feeling in regard to international relations, for I believe that meetings concerned with "good will and brotherhood" are now anachronisms. We need, rather, to focus a pitiless public opinion on those elements in our life which are built on the fact that war is a trait in our culture.

Some believe that war will never be abolished so long as we have the capitalist system, whatever that may be. Many of the causes of war, however, are not purely economic in nature, the causes, rather, are due to the gap between the economic system that we now have and the political system that we now have. This situation cannot be changed by changing over from capitalism to any other system. In a world increasingly interdependent we are now living on the fiction that national political systems are supreme over economic matters that have now become international concerns.

It may be too long a road to attempt to strengthen international machinery for the adjudication of these international concerns. Suppose, instead, that we were to prepare now by stating that in the event of a war in Europe the United States would not be entangled by insisting upon what we have called our neutral rights.

This doctrine of neutral rights, or freedom of the seas, is one of our pet doctrines; it is not held by other countries. We were entangled in the Great War because we insisted on the right to keep on trading with all the parties at war. The difficulties that followed finally got us into the World War.

Something like that may happen again, for there has not been an iota of change in the attitude of other nations in regard to neutral rights; in time of war, nations at war are concerned with nothing but their war objectives, and they act accordingly. Groups such as this Conference should begin to envisage what can be done to change our doctrine of neutral rights.

The important point is that our nation would have to announce in advance of any war that we would not insist on our neutral rights, that no loans would be made to warring nations, that it would be illegal to buy the bonds put out by warring nations, that all trade between ourselves and nations at war would be contraband trade (we now know that no distinction can be made in a modern world between "war" materials and any other kind of materials).

This would mean sacrifice, the price of peace, nationally speaking. It might not mean all cessation of trade with warring nations. We would simply announce in advance of a war that our

government would not protect anyone who might carry on private trade with warring nations.

I cannot refrain from making a point out of my experience for this group of women. I have discovered that there is more effectiveness in the expression of the opinion of citizens to their representatives here in Washington than is sometimes believed to be the case. These letters and telegrams get an extraordinary amount of attention here in Washington. It is not so much the volume of mail, sent out rather automatically by organizations and groups, that wins attention. Rather, it is the letter which comes from an individual betraying the fact that he knows what he is talking about and implying that he is a responsible influence in his community, and can affect votes.

QUESTIONS

Question. To what department in the government shall we look for initiative in clearing the question of neutral rights?

Answer. The State Department, presumably. The problem, however, is not merely one of law, it also has to do with the traditional attitude of our citizens toward such a law. We should have to educate an intelligent public opinion.

Question. If we accept Mr. Gidonse's advice that the main drive should be toward some change in our attitude toward mutual rights, what becomes of the idea of building up an international organization which would avert the possibility of war? If we withdrew as completely as he indicates, would we not be opposing the basic policy and aim of all peace efforts? We should be letting them go it alone.

Answer. There is a contradiction here. I myself would prefer to strengthen international machinery, but I question whether we could do this with sufficient strength and soon enough to avert international conflict.

Question. If one of our ships was destroyed by a nation at war, would we red-blooded Americans be able to keep our heads? Why not center our activities on avoiding the breaking out of war?

Answer. The appeal for strong international machinery has not, as yet, made much impression on those whom it must convince. Therefore, why not scrutinize what will happen to us in the next war if we do not change our position on neutral rights. Perhaps many who now oppose international machinery will then change their minds.

War Threats in Europe

By PARKER THOMAS MOON

IN THE midst of encircling gloom I am an incorrigible optimist, for I still think that we may have enough time to build an adequate international machinery to avert war. We might list several points which would make us a bit

less jumpy as we experience the war scares of each year. We used to be afraid of Mussolini, now we are no longer so frightened. We might indicate many instances in which wars that we once talked about as imminent have not come off. Such a list might bring us some confidence in the future. We might then understand that the dangers of war are deep rooted rather than on the surface, and that we cannot drift from one war scare to another without doing anything about underlying dangers beneath all of these situations.

Among the underlying dangers in Europe is the "delirium of victory," still lingering feebly in France and other victor nations, and preventing a sane revision of the peace treaties. Even more dangerous is the smouldering irredentism in central and eastern Europe, and the flaming irredentism of Nazi Germany. Changing the map here and there might heal a few of the worst sore spots, but the only real cure is a change of mind. No perfect map of Europe can ever be drawn, least of all with the sword. In the long run, the peoples of Europe must either accept an unsatisfactory map or face suicide by war. The third danger comes from political assassinations by nationalistic terrorists. Governments can use some police methods at this point; the League of Nations could be a help in building effective safeguards. The fourth danger is the commercial and financial warfare inspired by economic nationalism. If economic recovery does come, that may help greatly to reduce the tension in European politics. Finally, the hysterical increase of armaments aggravates all other dangers. And most perilous of all is the idea, now growing popular, thanks to air fleets and motorized armies, that the next war will come like a bolt from the blue, bringing quick triumph or instant disaster. That makes confident generals reckless, and goads nervous leaders to the desperate follies of panic.

Between France and Germany many thorny problems have been settled, almost incredibly, yet it remains to be seen whether France will allow formal cancellation of the reparations section of the Versailles treaty, including the war guilt clause; whether France will allow Germany to rearm; and whether France will try to keep her eastern allies loyal by insisting upon the status quo in the east. So far, France has allowed Hitler to rearm Germany, but has used her most brilliant diplomacy to save the situation in the East. France has surrounded Hitler with alliances and ententes, but the French bloc is not as solid as it looks. It might be wisdom for France to abandon the Barthou type of diplomacy, and return more vigorously than ever to the Briand policy of appeasing Germany and strengthening the League of Nations. As an historian I am convinced that there is no solution in the old policies having to do with balance of power.

In eastern Europe and along the Danube there has been a temporary relaxation. Now, with the Saar regained, Hitler may attempt to revive Germany's eastward Drang, toward Memel perhaps, or in Austria, or in Danzig and the Polish

TUESDAY SESSIONS

(Continued from Bulletin I)

TEN YEARS: PROGRESS OR RETROGRESSION?

By STEPHEN P. DUGGAN

OUR enemy is war. We shall not get rid of war by merely desiring to do so, nor because we deplore the evils associated with it. We shall get rid of war only as it is evident that it is to the interest of a given nation or of all the nations to get rid of it.

Perhaps universal pacts demand too much of the human race. It is in regions of the world where the peculiar problems of peace and war are known and recognized by that region that pacts are possible and practicable.

The most important step toward peace during the past ten years has been the development of the principal of Regional Pacts. This has been the result of a growing conviction that the League of Nations should welcome all agencies outside itself that are working for peace and not try to solve all the problems itself.

(a) The first and most important of these pacts was made just ten years ago—the Locarno Pact. This definitely fixed the present boundaries between France and Germany and between Belgium and Germany, thereby assigning Alsace-Lorraine to France and removing the greatest sore spot in Europe. Moreover, the agreement was guaranteed by Great Britain and Italy.

(b) The second pact of importance is the Balkan Pact, signed by all the Balkan states save Bulgaria and Albania, that is, Greece, Turkey, Roumania and Yugoslavia. The Balkan Pact is not so definite as that of Locarno, but in it the Balkan states agree to assure the maintenance of existing territorial boundaries in the Balkans and to undertake no political action or assume any political obligation toward any Balkan country not a signatory of the Pact without the consent of the other contracting parties. The Balkan Pact was desired by all the peoples of the peninsula in order to get rid of intrigue on the part of the Great Powers, especially France and Italy, in the spirit of the slogan, "The Balkans for the Balkan Peoples."

(c) The third pact is the one recently signed by France and Italy in Rome to which all the neighbors of Austria have been invited to adhere, as well as Poland and Roumania. It is intended to guarantee the independence of Austria. It probably will be agreed to by the other states with the exception of Germany.

(d) There remain two other proposed pacts. One is the Eastern Locarno, between Russia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Germany and France, guaranteeing the existing boundaries of the states of Eastern Europe. This will probably become a fact, though Germany may not agree, and possibly Poland also may not agree. The other pact, the proposed Mediterranean Pact, to decide naval ratios and parties in the Mediterranean, especially between France and Italy,

is so far a mere proposal. Turkey is particularly anxious that this pact be signed.

The second factor making for peace in the past ten years was the London Naval Conference of 1930. For although it did not solve the different demands of Great Britain, Japan and the United States, it did continue the 5-5-3 ratio in the matter of capital ships, and those states did agree not to build any new battleships during the life of the treaty. It relieved the three nations of a prospective heavy burden of expense.

The third factor in making for peace was the Lausanne Agreement, practically putting an end to the Reparation Problem which had disturbed Europe for so long. For although Germany was relieved of payments only on condition that the other European states were relieved of their obligations to the United States—which did not happen—nevertheless no one expects a revival of these payments.

The fourth hopeful factor in the cause of peace was the German-Polish Treaty of 1934, guaranteeing the status quo in the Polish Corridor for the next ten years. As the Corridor was considered a standing invitation to conflict, the treaty was a great step in advance.

The fifth step in the direction of maintaining peace was the admission of Russia to the League of Nations. As long as she was regarded as a pariah state, she was a potential danger. Committed to the Covenant by her admission to the League, she can be counted on as an influence for peace. Moreover, she sincerely wants peace for the completing of the industrialization of Russia and the collectivization of agriculture.

The sixth factor in the development of the principle of peace is the growing intimacy of the United States with the League of Nations. The fact that it has already joined the International Labor Office and may, we hope, shortly join the World Court presages an earlier membership in the League than looked possible a few years ago. A great campaign of education is now going on, looking toward a statement of the terms on which the United States would be willing to enter the League of Nations.

The seventh factor looking toward a greater degree of peaceful relations is the Good Neighbor policy of the United States toward Latin America, inaugurated by Mr. Hoover in our withdrawal from Haiti, followed by the policy of the present Administration. This has undoubtedly allayed suspicion of the United States which formerly prevailed throughout Latin America, and has developed a cordiality of feeling which never existed before.

The eighth factor looking toward a stabilized Europe was the Rome Conference between Laval and Mussolini because, besides settling some outstanding difficulties between France and Italy, this conference went far in relieving the tension in Central Europe. Its importance is

that Mussolini, who ever since the war had led the movement in favor of the revision of the peace treaties in order to secure revision of boundaries, made a right about face and became an adherent of the status quo provided by the peace treaties, until the boundaries can be peacefully adjudicated.

The ninth factor helping the cause of peace was the recent Saar plebiscite in which the vote was 90 per cent for return to Germany. This removes the last territorial problem existing between France and Germany. There may be economic or racial disputes between these two countries, but territorial problems no longer exist.

The tenth factor that may help the cause of peace is the exposure of the munitions traffic. The appeal to patriotism cannot be expected hereafter to be so potent in view of the enormous profits hitherto made by munitions makers even in times of peace, and in view of the internationalization of the trade to the extent that munitions makers have been willing to sell to both sides in a war, sometimes even to the enemies of their own country.

Just as there have been factors working for peace, so have there been factors working against peace during the past ten years.

The first of these is the failure of the Disarmament Conference. It met two years ago amidst the hopes and apparent determination of all the delegates. So far it has accomplished nothing. In the meantime, Germany has become almost as fully armed as France, contrary to the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles. Great Britain is trying to revive the Disarmament Conference, recognizing the validity of German rearmament provided that adequate guarantees are made for French security. These guarantees would involve the return of Germany to the Disarmament Conference and to membership in the League of Nations.

The second factor working against peace, partly the result of the failure of the Disarmament Conference, is the growing belief in militarism with a consequent increase in the burden of armaments. This is really a new movement. It no longer involves merely a faith in the strength of a nation's battalions as the chief defense against national defeat, it is a new spiritual force, a belief in militarism as the best inspiration for national strength and greatness.

The third factor working against peace is the expansion of economic nationalism. Every country, largely as the result of fear of inability to survive during a war, has gone in for national self-sufficiency. The resulting high tariff quotas for imports and bounties to stimulate industries whose products are more cheaply provided by other countries, have practically destroyed world trade and prevented recovery from the world depression.

The fourth factor naturally followed from the third, that is, the tragic failure of the London Economic Conference. The greatest hopes were concentrated upon this meeting in the belief that a way out of the economic depression would

be found. The failure was complete, and for it the United States is largely to blame.

The fifth obstacle to peace that has arisen during the past ten years is the weakening of the League of Nations by the withdrawal of Japan and Germany. This was a bad blow at the collective system and at the universality of the League of Nations. There is now a great country that is not a member of the League in all but one of the continents, that is, in Europe, Germany, in Asia, Japan, in North America, the United States, and in South America, Brazil, and in three of these continents it is the greatest country that is now outside the League. The League is still a weak instrument, although, in my opinion, it has more strength today than ten years ago. I believe that Germany will return to the League of Nations when the question in regard to equality of armaments is settled. I am hoping that the United States will associate with the League of Nations more closely than ever before. Nobody can now tell about Japan.

The sixth great force working against peace is the increasing rivalry between the United States and Japan in the Pacific. The yellow press and the militarists of both countries have developed a tension that, despite the unlikelihood of war between them, is a potential source of conflict. I cannot forget, however, that Japan is our best customer and that we are her best customer. If this trade were cut off it would mean catastrophe for the peoples of both nations. Despite the enormous budget voted by Japan this last year there is a growing opposition to the military program in Japan.

The seventh factor inimical to peace is the extension of the *Führer Prinzip*, as the Germans call it, that is, the Leader Principle, a euphemism for the dictatorship. By the censorship of the press, these dictators are enabled to lead their people to believe the most fantastic things concerning the attitude of foreign countries to their own and to develop an animosity that may require only a spark to set it off. Such ignorance of the true facts of a situation breeds fear, and fear breeds terrorism. Dictatorship and terrorism are synonymous terms.

Is the balance of these movements favorable to the cause of peace or to the cause of war? For ten years we have felt that war might break out at any time. As I traveled in these countries of Europe I felt over and over that the great mass of the people hated war. They have supported their governments in policies of economic nationalism and in programs of armament, but this fact does not minimize their hatred of war.

When, in the past year, crises have arisen in various parts of Europe, these situations have been met by the reasonableness of some leader or leaders in international conference. The League of Nations, after all, is a place where leaders consult and confer, and do it in public. No matter what goes on behind closed doors, when the time for decision comes that decision has to be made before the Assembly or the Council, and the whole world knows what is taking place.

It is my conviction that we are moving toward peace rather than toward war.

LITTLE WORLD, WHAT NOW?

By RABBI LOUIS L. MANN

THE text for what I want to say is this: Tell the truth about war, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free. To say that war always must be because there always has been war in the world is to accept a philosophy of fatalism more deadly than war itself. What is the real truth about war?

When our country went to war we forgot that some of us came from Kentucky, Tennessee, New York or Pennsylvania, because we were united in a common purpose. If this planet of ours were attacked by Mars it would be necessary to forget that some of us came from England, France, Germany or America because it would be necessary to unite against the common enemy—Mars. We are being attacked by Mars, not by the planet Mars but by the false god whose name is Mars. If we can unite for purposes of war and find ourselves unable to cooperate for greater purposes of peace, we are morally and spiritually bankrupt.

If I were asked to answer one of the most difficult of questions "What's wrong with the world?"—I would say that it is suffering from victory, from victory in battle, from the triumph of arms, from military success and from naval achievements. The world today stands on the brink of war because we fought and won a "war to end war." The world today is the victim of a mad race for competitive armaments and militarization because we fought and won a war "to make the world safe for democracy."

Commerce, education and science have all failed to abolish war. Rather, they have been utilized to further the purposes of war. It seems to me that religion, which overrides the boundaries of nations and transcends the barriers of race, should take its stand of opposition to all war at all times. If religion—not one religion and not in one country but if religion everywhere—would boycott war there could be no war. There should be no chaplain in any army. A chaplain is not there to comfort the dying and bury the dead. That is merely camouflage. He is there to give a divine sanction to the hellish business of human slaughter. The religion that, in the future, will ever bless war will thereby damn itself.

The only hope that we have of outlawing war is by telling the truth about war. War is founded on falsehood and propaganda. The world must learn that war is a superstition; that war never shows who is wrong, that it can only show who is strong. The old idea that God is on the side of the right is a superstition. God has nothing to do with war.

In searching for the truth about war we must never hesitate to reveal the folly, the fallacy, the futility and the fatality of force. We fought a war "to crush militarism" and never has militarism dominated the world more than today. The mad race for competitive armaments is burdening an already bankrupt world.

Nor is the biological aspect of the problem any brighter. Who goes to war? Not the flat-footed and not the near-sighted and not the degenerates, but the flower of every land marches forth to be mowed down like so many blades of grass, and the weaklings remain behind to become the fathers of the next generation. The humblest farmer knows that you cannot breed even hogs like that.

What is the sociological truth about war? Every city in every country could have been supplied with hospitals, recreation centers, playgrounds and school buildings for a mere fraction of the cost of war. The slums could have been cleared, diseases could have been stamped out, and poverty could have been obliterated. War, therefore, represents mobilization for chaos.

What is the economic truth about war? It cost \$30,000 to kill each man who was sent to his premature death in the last war. Four-fifths of all the revenue of the United States throughout its history has gone for wars, past, present and future, even though ours is the most peace-loving of countries.

What is the intellectual truth about war? From an intellectual point of view war represents intellectual bankruptcy, the prostitution of science to murder.

No war was ever fought by the truth. It is always fought with lies and propaganda. Every country pictures its enemy as a monster, when the truth is that each country must manufacture falsehoods to stir up hatred, without which war would be impossible.

The war system makes for a false concept of national honor, the vindication of might by right. It makes for jingoism and chauvinism. It must uphold the doctrine: "My country right or wrong." The ethics of this are, necessarily, sad and degrading.

Psychologists now agree that there is no such thing as pugnacious instinct, but if there were, and fight we must, let nations not fight one another but let them join to fight their common enemies: crime, corruption, disease, poverty, old-age insecurity, unemployment, national hatreds, racial animosities, and religious intolerance. Out of that common struggle the nations would realize the fatherhood of God in and through the brotherhood of man.

For Your Notebook

An article entitled, "Trouble of a Neutral" by Charles Warren is published in *International Conciliation*, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 405 West 117th Street, New York City, in the issue of June, 1934, Price 5 cents (Mentioned by Prof. Gideonse).

One of the 1935 topics for the Marathon Round Tables is "Neutrality and Freedom of the Seas."

The Foreign Policy Association and the World Peace Foundation expect to publish a "World Affairs Pamphlet" on Neutrality, which will be included with material sent to Marathon groups later in the year.

Corridor, or in the Ukraine. Any such move would be fraught with danger, yet delicate diplomacy may avert war for a time.

Stable peace can be had in Europe only at a great price. France and her allies would have to accept treaty revisions and boundary rectifications; Nazis and irredentists would have to renounce all hope of a perfect map; business interests and farmers would have to lay down some of their weapons of international economic war, munitions makers would forego some profits. Above all, the leading nations would have to decide boldly to rely less on armaments and more on the League of Nations for their security. And that implies the return of Germany to Geneva, and the entry of the United States into the League of Nations.

While the dangers of war are great, I see a breathing space ahead—time to pay the price of peace. But the price of peace in Europe must be partly paid by Europe and partly by these United States of America.

QUESTIONS

Question. Why do you expect this short breathing space? I doubt whether further revisions in the treaty structure will appease Germany and safeguard peace. Why not assume that all that France can do is to protect herself with her own means?

Answer. My reason for believing that we have this short breathing space is 1. Because of the profound desire of the people for peace. 2 I doubt whether Germany has yet armed sufficiently to be a menace to peace. As soon as Germany is armed adequately, France will face a show-down on her policies. At that time, it will be far safer to have a strong international organization.

Question. Do you think that the United States should enter the League of Nations?

Answer. We tried the Paris Pact; it has stopped some declarations of war but it has not stopped war. We have tried the policy of non-recognition, the influence of public opinion and proposals for disarmament, these have not worked. Now, let us try something that has worked—the League of Nations machinery. If the United States were a member of the League we could have real influence in making necessary revisions. Europe cannot make a go of it alone, a world organization is needed if a world war is to be prevented.

War Threats in the Far East

By GROVER CLARK

BASICALLY, war threatens in the Far East for the same reason that it does in the West. The nations have promised to keep the peace. They have set up machinery for settling their disputes peacefully. But they have not yet crystallized their wish for peace into a determined will to secure peace. When we of the West do that, when we are ready actually to use our peace machinery to keep our peace pledges, we shall be sure of peace—but not until then.

In the Far East, the danger of war is real today because Japan now is controlled by men

who are determined to secure for their country dominance in that part of the world—and because we of the West, in effect, have told these militarists and all the peoples throughout Asia that we do not take seriously our own peace pledges. By their move in Manchuria in 1931, the Japanese military chieftains created a situation precisely such as our peace machinery was designed to meet. We failed then, and we have continued to fail, to make that machinery work.

We also have failed in another vital way. We have failed completely to show by our dealings with this military-dominated Japanese government that our attitude was in any way affected by the fact that that government flagrantly had broken solemn international pledges to which it and our own governments were parties. We have continued to deal with this government precisely as though it had remained completely faithful to the pledges which it had made to and with us.

That, fundamentally, is why there is danger of war in the Far East.

Many Japanese, too, are sincerely convinced that peace and order and prosperity can be achieved in the Far East only through Japanese control. (And who are we of the West, with our talk of the "white man's burden" and our obligation to our "little brown brothers" to condemn the Japanese for believing that it is their duty to spread civilization even by the use of force?) Other Japanese seek dominance in the Far East for the glory of their emperor and their country. Still others are convinced that Japan's very economic existence depends on that dominance. Three powerful impulses thus furnish the driving force behind the military chieftains who would push Japan's boundaries ever westward into Asia.

These men, with this backing, have moved steadily forward. The acquisition of the Liuchiu Islands in 1870, the war with China in 1894-95, the war with Russia in 1904-05, the steady pressure for control by financial and more direct means of railway and mining rights in Manchuria from 1907 on, the annexation of Korea in 1910 after the most unequivocal pledge that there would be no annexation, the seizure of the former German holdings in Shantung in 1914, the presentation of the "Twenty-One Demands" in 1915, the attempts to buy control in China through the Nishihara loans in 1917-18, the maintenance from 1918 to 1922 of a much larger force in Siberia and northern Manchuria than the agreement with the United States and the Allies warranted, the dispatch of troops into Shantung in 1927 and 1928, the occupation of Manchuria beginning in 1931, the attack on Shanghai and the rejection of the Lytton commission's report in 1932, the withdrawal from the League of Nations in 1933, the blunt statement to the western powers in the spring of 1934 that they must keep their hands off China, the demand for naval equality and the formal notice terminating the Washington naval limitation treaty at the end of 1934—these and other similar moves through the past six decades and more have been deliberately designed to extend

Japan's control and to assert her exclusive dominance on the Asiatic mainland.

But there have been those in Japan who were sincerely liberal, who were eager to swing their country into cooperation with the other nations in bettering international relations. These civilian leaders took Japan into the League of Nations in 1919, in spite of considerable opposition from the military. At the Washington Conference in 1922, the liberals, again in the face of strong opposition at home, pledged Japan to the Nine Power Treaty, the Four Power Treaty and the naval limitation agreements with their 5-5-3 ratio. In 1927 and the first part of 1928 the "strong policy" group dominated the Tokyo government. But the flareup of anti-Japanese boycotts in China as a result of the dispatch of Japanese troops to Shantung turned feeling away from the militarists in Japan so that the civilians were able to attach Japan's signature to the Pact of Paris in 1928. In 1929-31, they were moving steadily forward to a settlement of the difficulties with China over Manchuria, a settlement which would have put relations there on the basis of friendly economic cooperation.

Then the military stepped in, as they had the power to do under the Japanese constitution and as they had done on previous occasions. They moved in Manchuria partly to extend Japan's holdings there but more to regain complete control in Japan. They succeeded, in both directions. So they have advanced. And they will continue to advance so long as control of Japan's government remains in the hands of those who now hold it—the Japanese military leaders.

In these circumstances, and in the light of this record, it is disastrous folly to place confidence in the pleasant assurances of spokesmen for Japan's foreign office that Japan earnestly desires peace. The men who give these assurances—such men as Foreign Minister Hirota and Ambassador Saito—unquestionably are expressing their own sincere hopes. The military leaders equally unquestionably, want peace, but on condition that they can have a completely free hand to do precisely as they please. As things now stand, however, there is no reason for believing that the liberals will be able to hold the Japanese military in check when these latter want to make their next move. The liberals have been helpless in the past, particularly in the period since September 18, 1931. They will be so again. No assurances of good intentions, no pledges to keep the peace, made by the civilian leaders of the present Japanese government are worth the paper on which they are written. Nor will any such assurances or pledges be really dependable until the Japanese people themselves cut out, to its uttermost roots, the cancer of actual or potential military control.

They will not do that until the West shows by its acts that it is determined to have peace and to deal justly in international relations.

The danger of war due to the military domination of Japan looms large in the foreground of the Far Eastern situation. But in the background is a far graver danger: the danger of a militarized China seeking revenge for all the in-

juries inflicted on it and on the rest of the Far East by the West.

For four centuries the Chinese watched the West forcibly impose itself on the East and on China herself. For 60 years they watched Japan rise step by step in world consideration as her armaments grew. Then, after the West's colossal demonstration of the ruinous folly of trying to settle disputes by force, they still watched while the West drew its beautiful blue prints of a new world in which men would deal with each other as civilized beings, reasonably. They saw the palace of peace rise, an elaborate structure of treaties and pledges solemnly entered into between the nations. They wondered how substantial that structure would prove to be.

China, the one creatively great and potentially by far the most powerful nation of the Far East, learned through millenniums of experience that reason and mutual adjustment are the only sound bases for continuingly profitable human relations. China now is passing through a period of disintegration. The reintegration has begun, however. Whether that reintegration will be around dependence on cooperation or on arms in international relations, is for the West to say. If the West should continue to give the lie by its acts of omission and commission to its words of peace and justice, China inevitably will continue along the road to arms on which she already has started. That road leads straight to a war between East and West which will destroy all civilization.

But if we would turn the currents which are running in the Far East into the channels of peace, we must act quickly, for already those currents are rising rapidly in the channels which lead to war.

The responsibility is ours. We cannot escape it by throwing up a smoke screen of words condemning Japan's militarists. They are moving along the line which we marked out. They are continuing on that line because we have not demonstrated conclusively that we ourselves have turned in a new direction. They will continue so to move, and the Japanese people will continue to follow them, until we give that demonstration. And China will follow, as Japan has, in our footsteps.

QUESTIONS

Question. (a) Is it not unfair to speak of the doctrine of neutral rights as an American policy? (b) Has not the United States insisted on the duties of neutral states?

Answer. I did not speak of it as an American policy, but there is no country that stresses it so much as does the United States. Yes, the United States has insisted on the duties of neutral states, but I am not convinced that making war humane is a sound approach.

Question. Do you think that such peace machinery as we now have in the United States will be effective in time of war?

Answer. Some of it has been and is effective, but the peace machinery of the United States has been completely inadequate in such situations as that of the Chaco, for instance, or the Manchurian dispute. I shall never be able to sleep in confidence that the Navy will protect my country as long as there is any danger of a European war. For our kind of world, nothing short of a world organization will be adequate.

INTERROGATION LUNCHEONS

The object of the interrogation luncheons is to provide an opportunity for the delegates to secure factual information and trustworthy opinions from competent and authoritative observers who have known these countries recently.

GERMANY

Presiding: Josephine Schain

DR. ESTHER CAUKIN BRUNAUER

Research Associate, International Relations, A A U. W. Spent the year 1933-34 in Germany and Austria as a Carl Schurz Foundation fellow.

DR. EMILY HICKMAN

Women's College of New Jersey. Spent the summer of 1934 in Germany.

MRS SHEPARD MORGAN

DR. ANNE SEESHOLTZ

Executive Secretary of the Council of Women for Home Missions. Spent summer 1933 in Germany.

MISS RUTH F WOODSMALL

Secretary, National Y. W. C. A. Visited Germany 1934.

JAPAN

Presiding: Mrs Arthur Brin

MR. MALCOLM DAVIS

Representative of the Carnegie Foundation at the League of Nations. Has been present in Geneva and attended the sessions of the Council and Assembly since the beginning of the Manchurian crisis.

MR. BEN DORFMAN

Member, United States Tariff Commission. Expert attached to the Lytton Commission.

MR. PAUL HARRIS

Director, Youth Movement for World Recovery, National Council for the Prevention of War.

MR. WILLIAM C. JOHNSTONE, JR.

Assistant Professor of Political Science, The George Washington University.

MR. FREDERICK MOORE

Author, and former press correspondent in the Orient.

DR. AURELIA H. REINHARDT

President, Mills College, California. Visited Japan, China and Manchuria 1931.

RUSSIA

Presiding: Mrs Herbert Y. McMullen

MR. JOHN S. CRIPPS

Member of Oxford Debating Team, 1934. Visited Russia September, 1934, with Sidney Webb.

DR. STEPHEN P. DUGGAN

Director, Institute of International Education. Visited Russia 1934.

MRS. FRANCES C. HUNTINGTON

President, Smith College Alumnae Association. Visited Russia 1931.

MR. W. CHAPIN HUNTINGTON

Secretary, American Embassy to Russia 1913-17. Visited Russia 1931.

DR. SUSAN M. KINGSBURY

Professor of Economics, Bryn Mawr College. Visited Russia recently.

MRS. CORLISS LAMONT

Former Secretary of the Zimmermann School, Geneva. Visited Russia 1931.

MRS. CASPAR WHITNEY

Former Director, National League of Women Voters. Visited Russia 1931.

Information and extra copies of the *Delegates' Worksheet* may be secured from the NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR, Headquarters, 1624 Grand Central Terminal Building, New York City.

TEA AT THE WHITE HOUSE

THE delegates to the Tenth Anniversary Conference on the Cause and Cure of War were guests of the President and Mrs. Roosevelt following the Interrogation Luncheons on Wednesday afternoon. An unusually heavy fall of snow made the view from the White House windows a scene that will not be easily forgotten.

Mrs. Roosevelt in greeting the delegates said that the President regretted that he was unable to be present. He asked Mrs. Roosevelt to tell the delegates that he felt that this Conference had helped him much.

DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE OF WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

By LAURA PUFFER MORGAN

I BRING you greetings from this committee, headquartered in Geneva. You, yourselves, helped to organize it in September, 1931, for two of your vice-presidents were present at that time. When the committee was organized no one dreamed that the Disarmament Commission would still be in existence at this time but the work of that committee is even more important now than in 1931. Its objective is to keep the women of 40 countries informed of the progress of events in moving toward limitation of armaments. This group will be interested in knowing how the work is financed.

Funds are contributed by the constituent organizations and the national sections of those organizations share in that. We had hoped that the committee might receive the Nobel Peace Prize; we had been proposed for this by Lord Cecil and by Arthur Henderson. As you know, Mr. Henderson, himself, was given this prize and he amply deserves it.

We hope, also, to secure funds through the sale of a postcard published by the committee and on sale here at the table of the National Committee on the Prevention of War (5 cents each; small reduction in price for quantity).

Because this committee exists in order to bring you information you will be interested to know how you can receive this material direct from Geneva rather than waiting for its distribution through your national organization. You can become an individual Friend of the Committee on the payment of \$1.00. I shall be glad to receive subscriptions here.

Who's Who

CLARK, GROVER, Lecturer, Wellesley College; formerly editor, *Peking Leader*.

DUGGAN, STEPHEN P., Director, Institute of International Education.

GIDEONSE, HARRY D., Associate Professor of Economics, University of Chicago.

MANN, DR. LOUIS L., Rabbi, Sinai Congregation, Chicago; member of faculty, University of Chicago.

MOON, PARKER T., Professor, Department of Political Science, Columbia University.

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

TENTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR, HALL OF NATIONS, HOTEL WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 22 TO JANUARY 25, 1935, INCLUSIVE

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

NO. 3

WEDNESDAY EVENING SESSION

Presiding: Esther G. Ogden

THE CONTROL OF ARMS

By GERALD P. NYE

THERE will be no lasting economic recovery until we devise ways and means of doing away with war which brought us to the depression. In the years since the war, despite the fantastic sums piled up in debts contracted in the war, less and less money has been spent for the education and care of the people in the nations of the world and more and more in building national machines for so-called defense. We assume in this nation that we do this because other nations are doing likewise. Some day we may awaken to realize that rather than leading in the cause of peace in some respects the leadership in the United States has been towards war. For instance, since the last war Japan has increased her military budget by 140 per cent. The United States has increased her military budget in these years 197 per cent.

There is no military authority who today can say how much more expenditures are necessary if we are to have adequate national defense. There is no greater security today, with this larger expenditure, than we had 20 years ago for a smaller sum.

We are controlled by slogans. "Look out for Japan," one hears in this country; in Japan the people hear the slogan, "Look out for the United States." In the past nine years in each autumn, just preceding decision on the army and navy appropriation, we hear this cry about danger from Japan. Last winter we appropriated over \$700 million; Japan appropriated over \$200 million, but we were scared when we heard this and so we swallowed the Vinson Navy Bill.

About 20 years ago a noted naval authority in our country wrote in regard to possibility of a war with Japan for the magazine *Asia*, as follows: "Authorities on both sides agree that neither side could win. The war would come to an end when and if one or both nations bled to death through the pocketbook. This danger is not much more than an apprehensive attitude of mind." How I wish that this article could have been on the desk of President Roosevelt when he signed the Vinson Navy Bill, for the

author of that article was Franklin D. Roosevelt, himself.

This propaganda here and in Japan, leading to the building of greater navies, has behind it the sordid desire of the munition makers for greater and greater profits. These men have learned that profit flows most freely for them when blood flows in the trenches. The record of the Munitions Inquiry reveals the bribery of public officials when embargoes are pending in regard to the shipment of arms to South America; letters addressed to lobbyists here in Washington seeking to prevent action contrary to their interests, attempts during the disarmament conferences to prevent agreements; armament lobbies in all the capitals of the world, letters to lobbyists in regard to blocking the investigation on the munitions inquiry.

The most vicious element in all this is that the government is in partnership with the munition makers, aiding them the world over in selling their goods. The government says that this is good policy, for only as we sell to other nations and so enlarge our export trade, can we maintain a capacity of production needed if we enter war. Yet that war might be with a nation to which these excess munitions had been sold.

There was a time when the United States, on the request of Peru, sent to that nation a committee of naval experts who advised the purchase of a certain number of destroyers and submarines. When Colombia saw the parade of these destroyers, they too asked for a commission to be sent to them; this commission, in turn, advised that Colombia should have a few submarines as a defense against Peru's submarines. Can it be that we may some day send a shipload of marines to straighten out a trouble in that section of the world which we, ourselves, have helped to bring on. There is evidence that the Navy is nothing more than a salesman's sample case for munition makers, and the American people pay the bill.

One munitions maker has remarked, "The country should not resent the fact that we have made a profit (incidentally, this profit was over 400 per cent in one year). If it had not been for our service to the cause of the Allies the

United States would today be a German colony." Patriotism—400 per cent patriotism! The day after this remark was made it was revealed that this same company had also sold their patents and designs to Germany. War is just as inevitable as is the necessity of going on rewarding those who get enormous profits out of war. Eliminate those profits and you will have eliminated the greater part of the causes of war.

What are we up against in facing this problem? We find that the munitions companies sell the identical machines to each nation. If there ever is a war with Japan our boys will be the targets of shells sold to Japan by American munitions makers, and for a huge profit. On last Army Day I watched the parade of marching soldiers. On their shoulders they wore gas masks to protect them from gases sold to other nations by American manufacturers. Their glittering steel helmets were produced at a profit in American steel manufacturers to protect them from shrapnel which that same manufacturing company has sold to a nation which one day may be our foe. During the war a splendid business sprang up in Switzerland, a factory which rolled out the trade mark of German and French steel makers on steel which was being sent from Germany to France, or vice versa. It would have been embarrassing for the French boys to have found the mark of Germany on a new instrument of steel manufactured across the line. For four years during the war, certain munitions plants on both the French and the German side were miraculously spared from any shelling attack, yet hospitals and homes were destroyed on every side of them. No military man will admit this fact; I am not prepared to say that there was collusion to bring this about. Yet, it was very odd!

What shall we do about it? It is obvious that the main answer is concerned with international agreements in regard to the control of arms, but we shall make a costly mistake if we think that the only solution is through international agreement. There is much that can be done in individual nations, much to be done in the United States. Munitions makers are comforted by those editorials which urge international agreement as the first solution. They know from their past achievements that they have techniques for blocking these agreements.

We need to make progress by doing some housecleaning of our own. 1. We can take the profit out of war whether or not the rest of the world wants to go with us in such a policy.

2. We do not need international agreements to take our government out of partnership with munitions makers 3. Nor do we need international agreement for the establishment of new neutrality laws. We can take the profit out of war, yes, and out of preparedness for war. This will involve nothing short of a nationalization of the munitions industry. The argument that the government cannot produce as cheaply as private industry has been amply disproved by a study made by a munitions industry itself. As for new neutrality laws, why not secure a policy whereby it would be unlawful to fly the American flag over any cargo whose destiny is a nation at war.

As for taking profit out of war, the answer is to tax it unmercilessly. Raise the tax on incomes up to \$10,000, perhaps double it. Raise the tax on incomes over \$10,000 by as much as 98 per cent. Do that, and you will see an increase of those who will take every means to keep the nation out of war. This will mean suffering on the part of those so taxed, but how about the suffering of those in the trenches.

QUESTIONS

Question. Might not a law taking profits out of war be repealed in a later Congress?

Answer. Yes, there is that danger, but if a government was appealing to young men to enlist for war, would a Congress at that same time dare to listen to the plea that the industry would rise to the crisis only if profits were increased? If so, the quicker we know this about our industrial leaders, the better.

Question. Why not the logical next step of our entrance into the World Court? Would not the nations better believe in our integrity if we took this act?

Answer. In the light of the record of international munitions makers in destroying international conferences and embargoes, what guarantee have we that their powers would not be as great then as now? Do not count too much on international agreements. Let us do something here at home. After that, I shall feel more serene in regard to our part in meeting the international situation.

Question. If manufacture of munitions were nationalized would this not penalize those small nations who are not now manufacturing munitions? Would they not be at the mercy of the Great Powers?

Answer. Yes, for a time, this consequent hardship worried me, but I now believe that I would much prefer this solution rather than to know that my country was lending aid and comfort to a traffic which was fomenting war all over the world.

Question. How shall we protest to President Roosevelt against greater naval expenditure?

Answer. I hope that one day we may all awaken to realize that we are in this mad armament race without knowing what is the point at which we can be said to have reached "adequate defense." This huge expenditure cannot much longer continue to rise in the face of the need of the peoples of the world.

Question. Why not prohibit exportation of armaments at any time, either in peace or war?

Answer. Some effort has been made to put up embargoes in the case of certain nations, but the lobby of the munitions trade has many ways of getting around this. As long as there is prospect of profits for this band of international racketeers we cannot do much.

Question. What is your definition of "adequate national defense?"

Answer. I should build a national defense which had as its purpose the defense of our own shores, including the Panama Canal. We could have this for a very small part of our present outlay.

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

Presiding: Dr. Aurelia Henry Reinhardt

THE MACHINERY FOR PEACE

The League of Nations

By JAMES P. POPE

IT was inevitable that after the catastrophe of the World War civilized people would organize to prevent such a catastrophe from ever happening again. If those who were killed in the war were to march past this hotel, four abreast, at double quick time, seven months would elapse. If all the money spent in the war were piled in silver coins, the pile would reach to the moon and two-thirds of the way to the moon again.

There are two very definite facts: 1. This is a different world as compared with 100 years ago because of the ease of our communications and transportations; contacts with other people are more acute and more frequent. 2. In olden times our efforts were largely individual. Now, the world's work is being done by groups, corporations, political groups, and nations.

For 1,000 years we have been developing a moral code between individuals. We are now in process of developing a moral code for group behavior. Is it possible for this group moral code to be extended to the life of nations in their interrelationships? The greatest document ever conceived in the history of the world is the preamble to the League of Nations Covenant written in 1920, the first great effort made to recognize and establish a moral code between the nations of the world.

This objective is true to a dominating principle in the history of the United States. The preamble to the Constitution of the United States includes these words, "To establish a more perfect union." While this was being phrased 11 separate disputes between the states were pending.

The same arguments were once made against the Supreme Court in its relation to such disputes as are made now in the Senate against the World Court. As conflicts develop between the nations there have been successively established the permanent Postal Service Union, the International Telegraph Union, and other such international bodies to deal with matters of concern to all nations. In his first inaugural address, in 1897, President William McKinley stated, "The leading feature of American policy throughout our entire national history has been our insistence upon the adjustment of difficulties by judicial methods rather than by force of arms."

It was not until after the war that we saw the inefficacy of the Hague Tribunal, a court of arbitration rather than a court of law. When the president of the United States in practically every message to the Senate and to the people urged the necessity of a concert of nations which would establish a moral code between the

nations, there was then no objection even from men like Theodore Roosevelt, Senators Lodge, Borah and Johnson. So a League of Nations was born and thereafter a World Court.

When wounded men returned from war to the United States there was a great revulsion against war on the part of the people, and this was played up by those who opposed our entrance into the League of Nations. For, in the stress of the presidential election those who had been ready to die for the League of Nations were not willing to sacrifice for it partisan considerations in electing a president.

In the meantime, dozens of disputes have been peacefully settled by the League of Nations. In the course of this history, there have been developments in the policy of the League of Nations; these policies have made it a league for peace rather than a league for war. Neither section X nor section XVI, dealing with sanctions, has ever been used. These sections have been construed as concerned with "force." We must remember, however, that police force, designed to preserve peace, is one thing, and that war to destroy peace is another thing. The League is now a conference room where men of goodwill interweave their ideas in the search for a formula for specific cases. Critics have deplored the fact that the League has had little effect upon the Manchurian and Chaco crises. If not had operated in those crises it might then have been today an institution of war and not of peace.

The present opposition to the League of Nations is directly related to that revulsion against war which we experienced when our soldiers returned from Europe. Jingoists and nationalists play upon the fear of the American people that our boys will again be sent into European conflicts. If this was once a reason against the League of Nations, it no longer obtains. In the reservation which is being proposed we assume no obligation to send soldiers to foreign soil.

So long as the hearts of men and women are filled with the desire for justice, leaders will arise to enable us to win this victory in the end.

QUESTIONS

Question. If the sections on sanctions are removed from the League of Nations Covenant, how shall we deal with such a nation as Japan?

Answer. I do believe in sanctions, certainly economic sanctions; whether that sanction shall have to do with military force is a large question. Personally, I do not disfavor police force if it is used properly. With the present development of civilization it seems necessary both in communities and in nations, but perhaps we need a reservation that we shall not be bound, in advance, to the use of it.

Question. Is it possible to establish the basis for a moral code with an Asiatic country like Japan?

Answer I happen to believe that all people are fundamentally alike, with the same hopes and aspirations. Although I prefer to live in the United States, I resent a holier than thou attitude in reference to other nations. I have never visited Japan, but I am sure that they are fundamentally like us, even though temporarily it is a nation led by an unwise group.

Question What would be the attitude of the Congress toward an international police force?

Answer I do not know, definitely, I would assume that the majority attitude would be against it largely because of this fear that our boys may be sent to foreign soil.

Question What is your recommendation to us for overcoming the jingo spirit in the United States?

Answer Go on doing what you are now doing, keep on educating, talking, working.

The International Labor Organization

By MARY ANDERSON

THE International Labor Organization has been called "a laboratory of social peace." At a Conference on the Cause and Cure of War discussion of such a laboratory or piece of machinery has a decided place. The International Labor Organization aims to eradicate certain potential causes of war, it was created just after the World War as a definite feature in the peace program, its purpose and function, its mechanism, methods, and membership are conducive to prevention both of industrial strife and war between nations. In August, 1934, the United States entered into full and regular membership in the International Labor office.

The undermining consequences of industrial conflicts are rarely confined to the borders of the country where they originate, repercussions are felt in other lands because of the competition between nations and because of their interdependence and interrelation. There are problems pertaining to labor, to the workers of the world, who can be used by magnates or potentates for carrying out their unfair schemes, unless efforts are made to thwart any such designs. Just as no solution of political problems seems possible today apart from a consideration of the economic questions confronting the nations involved, so no real solution of economic problems can be satisfactorily arrived at without corresponding attention to the matters affecting the millions of wage earners, who are the rank and file responsible for turning the wheels of industry in time of peace, and for wielding the weapons of death and destruction in time of war.

The appointment of the Commission on International Labor Legislation was one of the first acts of the Peace Conference of 1919. This commission, of which Samuel Gompers was made president, was the constitution-making body of the present I.L.O. Its constitution was approved by the Peace Conference, April 11, 1919, and the First Labor Conference was held in Washington, October 1919. The Labor Charter of the Peace Treaty is at once a scheme of constitutional organization and a declaration of labor principles.

A General Conference of representatives of the members of the I.L.O. is held at least

once a year, each member state being required to send four delegates—two representing the government and two representing respectively the employers and the workers of the country. The chief function of the conference is to draw up a code of international measures termed Draft Conventions, relating to conditions of labor, as well as certain recommendations laying down guiding principles on labor problems. A Draft Convention is an international agreement or treaty, the application of which by the countries that have ratified it is guaranteed by the constitution of the I.L.O.

The conference itself does not make international laws, its decisions are not binding on any country unless that country agrees to accept them by legislative or executive action, then the conventions become the law in that country. Thus the conference paves the way for the passing of national laws on international lines.

Up to July 1, 1934, 44 states had ratified one or more of the Draft Conventions set up at the first or subsequent conferences, the total number of ratifications being 631. The moral force of these standards is considerable even upon countries which may be prevented by technical or administrative difficulties from taking the step of formal ratification. The Draft Conventions cover such subjects as hours of work, wage policies, labor supply and unemployment, protection against sickness, provisions for old age, protection of women at childbirth and against night work and protection of children in the matter of industrial employment, etc.

The membership of this organization is truly international, consisting of 62 members out of 64 presumably eligible governments.

May I give a picture of the I.L.O. in action, by reporting briefly upon the matters that came before the conference at Geneva in June, 1933, which I attended as chairman of the Official American Delegation to that conference, the first time that this country had ever sent an official observers' delegation.

The report of the director at this June, 1933, conference was devoted mainly to the social and economic aspects of the depression, extent and causes of unemployment and various measures of relief, wages, reductions, purchasing power and the late change of policy, social insurance, effects of the depression, reduced incomes and increased expenditures and the consequent amendments to laws and regulations. The 50 new ratifications in 1933 (the highest number since 1929), sent in by 21 countries, was reported as "a proof of the vitality of international labor legislation." The history of the movement for the 40-hour week was reported, as far back as January, 1931, the Unemployment Committee of the Governing Body invited the Labor Office to pay special attention to this desire of the workers' organizations.

Finally, the United States observers noted with special interest the director's repeated references to international planning and cooperation. Is it possible to raise wages in one coun-

try, he asked, unless a corresponding increase takes place in competing countries? Is it possible to make wages the subject of international negotiations? Are truces against wage cuts, or international wage agreements, possibilities of the future? Can the consuming power of the masses in Asia and Africa be raised by international economic action?

Of particular interest to us as Americans was the stress which Director Butler gave at the June, 1933, Conference to the value and importance of the United States' participation. Here are his words: "Perhaps I need hardly say that it is a very special pleasure to me to see an American Delegation here for the first time this year. We value this cooperation all the more on account of the great industrial reconstruction which is now being undertaken in the United States. Anyone who is interested in the problems of this organization is bound to follow this effort with the closest attention."

As you know, last June the Congress and the President of the United States took the action required for the United States to seek membership in the I.L.O.; a few days later the United States was formally invited to become a member by the International Labor Conference in its Eighteenth Session; and August 20, 1934, marked the formal entry of the United States into membership in the I.L.O.

The economic and social questions that come before the conference are interwoven with similar questions in the United States. Social insurance that has had its place on the statute books in the countries in Europe, South America and the East, we in the United States are just beginning to consider. In view of the competition among countries—due to inequalities in wages and hours of work—the attention that will be given by future conferences to such economic questions as the shorter working day and the raising of wages and purchasing power will be of particular interest to the United States. There is no doubt that this international organization has been a great factor in raising standards of employment the world over, and membership in it will undoubtedly be influential in improving standards in our own country.

What will be the price of the membership in the International Labor Organization to the United States? In asking this question it is not the material cost in dollars and cents with which we are concerned, but, rather with matters of greater intrinsic value than the mere coin of the realm. In estimating the price we shall pay in increased responsibility for, and share in, world problems, we should at the same time evaluate the gains in our own national progress.

In view of the objective, the cost of membership in the I.L.O. as part of the price of peace seems but small as compared with the great gains in social and industrial welfare when men and women will work and live under much better conditions and be guaranteed economic security as a result of satisfactory international labor standards. Such measures will serve as a great stabilizer in keeping peace between na-

tions When we have eliminated the expensive processes of warfare and have applied that wealth to peace activities by international cooperation, we shall have done for humanity that which is the most essential for all time

QUESTIONS

Question Can you tell us who in the United States was responsible for initiating our membership in the I L O ?

Answer I should say the responsibility lay between the Secretary of Labor and the President

Question Could the I L O do anything toward having a permanent ambassador of peace in every nation from every other nation?

Answer Representatives from I L O. are such, whether they are called ambassadors or not, because peace is so tied up with economic questions

Question What government action was necessary to become a member of the I L O

Answer A resolution was passed in the Senate and House saying that the United States wished membership in the I L O.

Question. Will the I L O raise or lower the standard of living in various countries? Will it preserve American standards, our labor standards are so different from those in other parts of the world

Answer I hope that we will be able to preserve ours and raise the standards of others

Question What part does Russia play in the I L O.

Answer Russia, as you know, has just been admitted to the League and I presume that that means eventual membership in the I L O.

The Part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in Building Up a Peace System

By LEONID M. TOLOKONSKI

I WANT to say a few words about what we in the Soviet Union call our "struggle for peace" I am told that the expression has an odd sound to some American ears, that to them the juxtaposition of "peace" and "struggle" suggests a contradiction But we believe that peace, like most other good things, can be obtained only by persistently struggling for it. We believe that this struggle for peace is one of the most important tasks—probably the most important of all tasks—confronting the world today Certainly it is a primary factor of Soviet foreign policy and the Soviet Government during recent years has many times manifested its eagerness to cooperate with other countries to strengthen the cause of peace

The Soviet Government ratified the Kellogg-Briand Pact renouncing war as an instrument of national policy on the day the pact was presented to it. It was the first government to ratify While we were glad to adhere to such an agreement in all seriousness, we of course had no illusions that if all countries signed their names to that paper the golden age of peace would be inaugurated and armed aggression would be ended forever. None the less, the pact was worth while At the worst, it was a gesture against aggression.

Why is the Soviet Union opposed to war? For seventeen years, the Soviet Government, with the support of the workers and toiling

masses of the Soviet Union, has been striving toward creating a new society, to change the social-economic-political regime in force for centuries replacing it with a new system

In order to fulfil our task, it is of the greatest importance to have peaceful foreign relations, not to be interfered with by any war The only thing we do not need is expansion of territory, the acquisition of new territories We are able to fulfil our task within our existing borders where we have everything we need

But, this is not our only reason for opposing war We are against war also because it would delay and destroy our efforts in building up a new society.

Thirdly, we definitely know that in any war the workers and toiling masses are those who lose The Soviet Government represents a regime where the workers and toiling masses are the main forces of power, and such a government will, obviously, do everything possible to prevent those masses from paying with their lives the price of war

We do not want war. We have no desire for conquest of foreign territory, and we have every wish not to have thrust upon us the duty of evicting an invader from our own territory, not to subject our new factories and collective farms and our new cities to the enormous destruction and waste of war.

With this sentiment for peace animating our country, we realize that there is nothing to be gained by attempting to sit isolated behind locked frontiers. The Soviet Union does not resort to an isolationist policy. We cultivate a broad exchange of goods with other countries, an exchange of scientific, technical and cultural ideas. All such exchanges promote understanding and friendship among nations and assist progress

Our "struggle for peace," to use the Soviet phrase, began with the birth of the Soviet Republic It took definite form at the conclusion of the intervention and civil wars We sought peace with our neighbors, and to this end, we sought agreements to make this peace mutually advantageous and binding. This definite effort began a dozen years ago, and for several years it made little progress As early as 1923, the Soviet Government invited the border countries to a disarmament conference, but this move proved futile

The ice was broken when the first non-aggression pact was signed with Turkey in 1925 During the next two years, several other countries, Afghanistan, Lithuania, Persia and Germany signed similar agreements Then came a hiatus until 1932, when the four other countries on the western border signed, and also France. Today the Soviet Union has non-aggression agreements with fourteen countries, singly and in groups, and in the case of 11 of these the treaties contain a strict definition of aggression.

This definition of aggression is a development of the past three years and it is a most important one, for as every intelligent person knows, no government ever admitted that it waged a

war of aggression—the aggressor is always the other fellow Here, we believe, is a new step forward in the "struggle for peace." In February 1933, Mr Litvinoff, Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, submitted a definition of aggression before the General Commission of the Disarmament Conference at Geneva and formally proposed that it be embodied in the convention on security and disarmament This was referred to a sub-committee which gave its approval The idea is still on the agenda and I think it has steadily gained in prestige at least Among thoughtful people it is increasingly realized that a concrete definition of this kind is necessary to make a non-aggression pact workable and binding.

As late as July 1933, the Soviet Union, at the time of the World Economic Conference in London, signed a series of agreements with a whole chain of its neighbors, from Finland to Afghanistan, as well as with three countries of the Little Entente, by which this definition of aggression is accepted by all those countries as an integral part of the pacts of non-aggression

Seven years ago, when Soviet delegates began attending the disarmament conferences at Geneva, Mr Litvinoff made two proposals One was a plan for complete disarmament. The second was an alternative proposal worked out in full detail, for progressive disarmament. The conference did not fold these proposals to its bosom.

At these international conferences also the Soviet delegates supported every practical proposal for arms reduction put forth by the delegates of other countries, including the American proposal for a one-third cut in arms budgets, presented in 1932. But all of these, also, eventually came to nothing The disarmament conferences steadily came to nothing.

In the face of this impasse, the Soviet Government has been searching for any means which can stop the menace of war, which can bring closer cooperation among different countries for the cause of peace, and when the delegates of the thirty members of the League of Nations sent their joint invitation to the Soviet Union, asking the Soviet Government to become a member of the League of Nations, the Soviet Union joined the League of Nations. It was on this basis—to organize peace—that membership was accepted by the Soviet Government.

I quote Mr Litvinoff in accepting membership in the League. He said:

"We are now confronted with the task of averting war by more effective means. The failure of the Disarmament Conference, on which formerly such high hopes were placed, in its turn compels us to seek more effective means We must accept the incontestable fact that in the present complicated state of political and economic interests, no war of any serious dimensions can be localized and any war, whatever its issue, will turn out to have been but the first of a series. The lesson of the World War, the results of which both belligerents and neutrals are suffering from to this day, must not be forgotten."

Along the lines of "averting war by more effective means," Mr Litvinoff made two major proposals. One was that the League replace the abortive disarmament conferences by a permanent body whose functions would be to keep a check on situations threatening peace and to keep a check on armaments. The other proposal was for an Eastern Locarno to bind the peace in Eastern Europe. These proposals are now before the League and before the nations.

I have given you some of the major points in what we call "the struggle for peace." These efforts will continue. There have been discouragements and set-backs and there has been some progress. I think it can be said that the idea of regional pacts binding countries together to keep the peace is now established as a factor in necessary peace machinery. I believe the idea of a hole-proof definition of aggression is increasingly accepted as a necessary part of such pacts. This is a step forward, by no means a decisive one, but a real step. As Litvinoff remarked before the League "Peace and security cannot be organized on the shifting sands of verbal promises and declarations. We should establish that any State is entitled to demand from its neighbors, near and remote, guarantees for its security and that such a demand is not to be considered as an expression of distrust. Governments with a clear conscience and really free from all aggressive intentions, cannot refuse to give, in place of declarations, more effective guarantees which would be extended to themselves and give them also a feeling of complete security."

I am glad to say that the Soviet Government will have the solid support of its 170 million citizens as it continues its efforts to organize and support this cooperative effort to wipe out the plague of war.

QUESTIONS

Question. Where does Russia stand on the matter of revision of treaties?

Answer. We are against revision of any treaty by means of war. If treaties are revised by the processes of the League of Nations, that is another matter.

Question. Will you define aggression?

Answer. When an army crosses a frontier of a foreign country, this may be called aggression.

Question. When Russia says that it does not want war, does this cover imperialistic or class wars?

Answer. If a revolution breaks out in a country, the Soviet government will not sanction a war by sending its army to that country. As for class wars, my definition deals only with wars between countries—not within a country.

Question. What is the present policy of the Soviet in regard to a warm water port?

Answer. Russia does not need a warm water port in the Far East for expansion. Vladivostok is sufficient.

Agreements for Peace

By PIERRE DE LANUX

I SHALL not speak against war, for very few are left who believe that war is desirable. Nor shall I speak in favor of peace, for peace is not to be pleaded for but to be preserved and organized.

War is not an act of God but of men, and men can prevent it if they are not too absent-minded about it. The League is the chief instrument but not the only one. It has been necessary to implement the attitudes and objectives of the League in certain specific areas, therefore, countries have resorted to separate pacts for this objective. These separate pacts make the Covenant more binding, more specific and precise in certain situations. There is one exception to this description of these separate pacts, the Kellogg-Briand Pact, which restates the renunciation of the free and sovereign right to make war, a restatement of this same renunciation in the Covenant of the League.

Why has there been need of these pacts? It is because the Covenant was not reassuring enough to those nations which had definite fears for their frontiers.

We understand better now the reasons why such nations as the United States did not join the League of Nations. 1. The League had not proved its usefulness. 2. The United States needed no additional protection. 3. There was distrust of those who were then leaders in the countries at that time.

There was one point, however, on which the American people were deluded, their belief that by joining the League they would be helping the reactionary forces in Europe. These reactionary forces were relieved when the United States did not join!

As the years went on, the leaders tried to pick up the pieces and to build the kind of international machine which had been envisaged. This period began in 1923-24 when the prime ministers of England and France went to Geneva for the first time. In 1924 leaders tried to set up the Geneva Protocol, but England was not willing "to sign a blank check" committing her to protect any nation attacked for any reason; 20 nations, however, were ready to sign. It was then decided that a limited agreement within a certain area was a better tactic for mutual assistance in times of aggression. The Locarno Pact, therefore, was the expression of the will of nations to pay a high insurance premium against war in these defined areas. Later on, other pacts developed, the Balkan Pact, the Little Entente, and now there is talk of an Eastern Locarno. These pacts are registered by the League.

What are some of the effects of these pacts? The Locarno Pact was the beginning of a constructive period in the history of international relations, the Brand-Stresemann period. After 1930, however, a series of unfortunate events brought more difficulties in the building of international machinery.

A sense of insecurity has been developing which has brought us back to the urgent need for reinforcing our mutual pledges for security, and thus has developed new regional pacts.

There will always be war as long as someone thinks that war will pay. The danger is that although one nation may know that war will not pay, another nation may think it profitable;

it is not enough to know that that other nation is mistaken. It is increasingly true that any nation that would attack another nation in Europe today would know that this nation would not stand alone.

There are now three classes of nations, a classification which does not imply that one group is more civilized or peace-loving than the other. 1. Certain nations think of the League obligations as satisfactory and accept them to the full. 2. There are nations who think the Covenant more than they can endorse, they would set up reservations. 3. Other nations think the League of Nations not sufficiently binding and see the need for supplementary pacts for those nations which see specific signs of danger.

There is no country today where understanding of world affairs is so complete as in the United States. Therefore, whatever decision you take in regard to membership in the League of Nations, you will know what you are doing. Groups at work on peace efforts in other countries seem to be ready to accept any reservation made by the United States. They would resent, however, any reservation which weakens the present machinery and paralyzes the methods for enforcing peace.

Groups at work on peace efforts in France and England are following with interest everything that you do. There is much interest in the Nye Muntions Inquiry. This is a new situation. It may be that understanding between groups at work for peace in the nations is ultimately more important than understanding between national governments. We need to find new ways by which we can cultivate and develop this spirit of understanding.

QUESTIONS

Question. How do you justify the fact that the League of Nations has ignored its responsibility of upholding minority rights in some countries?

Answer. It seems to me that the League has functioned in this respect, first, by what it has actually done through the processes of the League. It is also true that the very fact of the existence of the League's minority procedure prevented what otherwise would have happened without it?

Question. Will Germany return to the League?

Answer. Why put this question to me? Of course Germany is still a member of the League, for the withdrawal period will not close until October. It is hoped that Germany will return to the League, for the qualities of her leaders were appreciated in the Secretariat and on committees.

Question. Would not an exchange of editorial material between France and the United States, for instance, be of help?

Answer. There is such an exchange, and the response to it has been such that it is to be continued. If you are interested in seeing the digest of material from French newspapers, write to *Courier des Etats-Unis*, 610 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Question. What about the failure of the League in the Manchurian crisis?

Answer. This was not a failure of the League of Nations, but the failure of the nations in using the League machinery.

Question. If countries are united in pacts outside the League will this not mean a return to the principle of balance of power?

Answer. No, these pacts are not only in the spirit of the League, but are actually reinforcements of League machinery.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Presiding: Mrs. Quincy Wright

SHALL WE PAY THE PRICE? A DISCUSSION

Prerequisites for Disarmament

By LAURA PUFFER MORGAN

THE Disarmament Conference was made necessary by the demand of Germany that the Allies should honor their promises made to her at Versailles that German disarmament should be only the first step in a general reduction of armaments never yet undertaken. Most of us have forgotten this fact, for before the conference was called, to the German demand had been added the clamor of the peoples of every country for relief from the burden of military expenditures.

Even the delegates tended to forget this fact. The history of the whole first period is that of an attempt to solve the question of disarmament by technical means, without reference to political problems.

The problem is: how bring down the armaments of those nations which have not been disarmed by compulsion, without upsetting the peace of Europe?

This means a sacrifice on the part of the heavily armed Powers, first, of whatever military security their superiority in arms may bring them, and, second, of the material advantage that accrues to them indirectly as a consequence of military prestige and power. It is impossible to deny that the progress of disarmament has been steadily blocked by the unwillingness of these states to make this sacrifice. On the other hand, no government is in a position to criticize them. It is for the others who share the responsibility for the Versailles Treaty to promise them some political security to take the place of the military security that they give up, and to convince them that with a disarmament treaty they stand to gain more than they lose. This political readjustment must be made if the peace of Europe is to be established on any sure basis. That, after three years of discussions and negotiations, is at last clear.

Diplomats all desire and yearn for disarmament, provided it can be attained without a loss of political advantage to themselves. Where it does entail such loss compensation is demanded. It comes down to this: a problem of bargaining between those who demand a certain compensation for disarmament and those who are unwilling to pay the price; for instance, between France, which demands certain guarantees of security, and Great Britain and the United States, which so far have been unwilling to pay the price.

France has a perfectly plausible reason for not fulfilling what Germany calls the pledge to disarm. The French say that when that clause was put into the treaty it was understood that the United States would be a member of the League; it had also been proposed that there

be a tri-partite treaty between France, the United States and Great Britain, by which each nation would go to the aid of the other. Neither of these two things came about; therefore, the French say that they need more guarantees of security than they now have.

Most of us assume that the course of a Disarmament Conference has been consistently downward. If I were to draw a graph, however, I would draw it into three parts of a discontinuous curve; the down portions of this curve came at points where some leader, or some nation, made a serious blunder.

The Hoover proposal of 1932 had only a temporary stimulating effect. It did not meet the price. Attention was finally focused upon the real issue by the refusal of Germany to participate further in the conference until her demand for equality should be faced. Even after the principle of equality was accepted by the resolution of the five Powers, the same political maneuvering went on under the guise of technical questions, resulting finally in the withdrawal of Germany from the Disarmament Conference and the League and the adoption of the method of direct negotiations between the governments in order to bring about the necessary concessions for an agreement.

At this time in the conference Senor Madaraga said, "There are no technical arguments; there are only political arguments in uniform."

The first real hope of success and the first real concession to the French point of view came with the announcement by Mr. Norman Davis in May, 1933, that President Roosevelt was willing to agree to consultation in the event of a breach of the peace and not to interfere with any collective action against an aggressor determined upon by the other Powers, provided that the United States Government agreed with the designation of the aggressor. This, together with our acceptance of the principle of effective supervision as a part of the disarmament treaty, was what France wanted in the way of concessions from the United States.

QUESTIONS

Mr. Stone: Did not this proposal of Mr. Davis come rather late, too late?

Mrs. Morgan: I quite agree. One of the tragedies of the Disarmament Conference was a lack of proper synchronization. Every concession came too late. As one person said, "Its tragedy lies in its time-table."

To continue. In June, the London Economic Conference opened its sessions. Many of us believe that if the Disarmament Conference could have then had another month or two, a disarmament treaty might have come through.

Mr. Stone: We, in the United States, have thought of this as an excuse for failure, rather than an explanation.

Mrs. Morgan: I do not agree. I believe that

the tide was running so strong that some success might have come if the delegates could have gone on. Many of the delegates to the Disarmament Conference were also delegates to London. I recall that on the 8th of June when Arthur Henderson received a group of delegates from the League of Nations Societies he said that he hoped that a disarmament treaty would be signed in the autumn meeting of the League Assembly. But in the meantime, the Nationalist Socialist Party had come into power in Germany and when the delegates to the Disarmament Conference met in the autumn the political situation had distinctly changed. The Germans learned that there would be a proposal for a four-year period of probation before Germany could rearm. It was this that finally led Germany to withdraw from the Conference and from the League of Nations.

Last June the Disarmament Conference almost arrived at dissolution. After a tense week, on June 8th the delegates decided to go on until a treaty could be agreed upon. From that day on, it has been impossible to embark on a discussion of the underlying political questions in regard to Germany's equality and France's requirements. Now the conference seems to be set on a new line by the proposal of the United States, for it now seems useless to talk of a general disarmament treaty. The proposal of a separate protocol on the control of the manufacture and export of arms, publicly in regard to the expense of national defense expenditures and the establishment of a permanent disarmament commission will be reported to the Disarmament Commission in February by the committee to which this proposal has been referred.

This is the present situation. 1. Germany must first be brought back to the Disarmament Conference. She will not return without equality. 2. France says that she will not allow Germany to rearm nor will she reduce her own armaments without compensation. England and the United States will exact for German rearmament these conditions: 1. Automatic and periodic supervision of the manufacture of armaments. 2. Regulation of the trade in armaments. 3. Willingness to consult in the event of a violation of a treaty or a breach of the peace. 4. A guarantee that all signatories will see that the treaty is carried out.

What Do We Mean by Defense?

By WILLIAM T. STONE

IT is somewhat discouraging to admit that if there is to be a disarmament treaty it probably will not have much disarmament in it. It will be a limited treaty which may include some effective control on the trade and manufacture of arms.

Do you remember President Wilson's program on disarmament. 1. Reduction of national armaments to the lowest point for domestic safety. 2. Enforcement by international co-operation of national action in this direction. In those fatal days in Paris in 1919, an attempt was made to apply the first point to the situation of Germany. Her arms were reduced to the lowest point for domestic safety. When this was applied to other powers, however, the word

domestic was changed to national. This was a fatal change, for thereby armaments were considered as instruments of national policy. Then came the United States' defection from the League of Nations.

In the succeeding years the nations of the world have sought without success to achieve that limitation and reduction of armaments which was to have been one of the first tasks of the League of Nations. The Disarmament Conference which assembled with such high hopes in 1932 is today maintaining its existence only by the doubtful process of repeated postponements and delays. As I look at the Disarmament Conference I feel much less hopeful than Mrs. Morgan, for it seems to me that the basic obstacles that she has stated are almost insuperable.

Mrs. Morgan: What would you call an effective disarmament convention?

Mr. Stone: Certainly not one that calls for a substantial increase in war machinery and personnel, nor one that would probably provide loopholes for increases. Such a convention means going on with the war system.

Mrs. Morgan: I contest this point of view. I would say that the Disarmament Conference would have really served its purpose if it brings a treaty which France and Germany would sign. Such a treaty would at least bring a breathing space, and would relieve the tension so that other political matters might be settled.

Mr. Stone: And, yet, after ten years the Washington treaty has been renounced because those who signed it did not alter a single tenet of their national policy in regard to armaments. What good has that breathing space done us?

Mrs. Morgan: Yes, but ten years ago the feeling between Japan and the United States was much more dangerous than today. Besides, the Washington treaty has saved us an expenditure of 30 billions of dollars. It seems to me that the crucial problem is to make peace between France and Germany. After that we can work further for the reduction of armaments.

Mr. Stone: It is essential in Europe that France and Germany come to agreement but what they need is not so much an agreement on armaments as on the basic policies that each is pursuing in Europe. This has application for us in the United States. We have too much thought of disarmament as a matter for Geneva and international agreements, and too little in terms of necessary changes in our own national policies. Year after year we make huge naval and military appropriations. Yet, no one asks, "After all, what for?" What do we mean by national defense?

I also disagree with Mrs. Morgan in regard to the relation with Japan, the situation seems to me to be very bad and growing worse. We are endeavoring to develop and restore the balance of power in the Far East. We have a small standing army, yet it is the nucleus of four million men, the same number that we supplied in the last war, two million were sent to France. Do military authorities think that four million

men are needed for the defense of American soil? President Roosevelt, in an address a year ago, stated our intent not to send arms across our borders. This would call for a revision of the national policies of all the great powers.

Mrs. Morgan: Do you think that we can change our national policies without getting other nations to do the same?

Mr. Stone: Eventually we must secure international agreements, but we, ourselves, are in a position to take a lead and act alone. We have a vast ocean on the east and another on the west. Airplanes are not so yet developed as to span these oceans. The time for doing something is now, when we are secure from invasion. The time is short, and we must begin now to pay the price of peace in a wholesale revision of outworn institutions and policies that lead to war.

Proposals for Governmental Action

By WALDO STEPHENS

THE basis of the action of modern states leading to armed conflicts is deeper and broader than the sentiments which motivate the crusade against war: nationalism, self-sufficiency, self-aggrandizement, self-defense and self-help; capitalism with its inherent conflicts intensified by the advance of industrialism and imperialism; race superiority with its refusal to grant equality to other races or surrender its chosen fields of influence and possessions. Given these three factors to determine social organization and behavior, without means for peaceful adjustment of disputes, and you cannot escape militarism as the instrument employed by states to defend what each national group terms its national interests.

A second observation: Our social institutions which are organized to express the ideology of these basic movements of the western world are inadequate in their present form for translating the real desire of millions of men and women into practical achievements of peaceful conduct of world affairs. Each national unit is organized and functions for the protection of specific interests and not to make the organization of peace its primary objective. The universal desire for peace is blocked when an effort is made to express in some concrete way such as disarmament this desire, through the institutional policies and procedure belonging to the ideology of nationalism, industrialism, imperialism, race superiority and militarism.

Another observation: Our world society is marked by the constant clash of two powerful forces: the effort to maintain the status quo which suggests order and stability for certain nations and groups; the inevitable movement making for change. Wars grow out of this everlasting conflict.

Every proposal for the improvement of the relations of states must be subjected to certain very rigid tests: 1. Will the proposed governmental action achieve the desired objectives? 2. Will the secondary effects of the proposed

action prove beneficial or injurious? 3. Will the plan of action require leadership with more courage, foresight, ability than the present level of world society can supply? 4. Will the proposal demand public support which the present stage of public opinion is unable to sustain?

Among the current proposals which have a certain popular appeal but little assurance of practical achievement in lessening the possibility of war may be listed the following:

1. The modification of the Immigration Law of 1924 to permit Japanese nationals to be admitted to the United States on a quota basis, to lessen the tension between the United States and Japan. It does not make sense to advocate a modification of the immigration law without going the whole way to decide such important questions as naval ratios for Japan and the United States, our Open Door policy in China, our Asiatic trade policy, treaty commitments, etc. The questions of peace or war in the Pacific turn on issues far more difficult than our immigration law.

2. The proposal of an Anglo-American Alliance. The theory behind this suggestion is that the combined influence and power of the two leading English speaking nations would result in holding the world in line. Such action might unite the continent of Europe against such a combination, with Japan thrown in for good measure. This proposal assumes that the English speaking nations are the only ones that can be trusted to keep the peace. The policy of peaceful adjustment of conflicts should be adhered to in dealing with all other powers.

3. The proposal of legislation to curb the activities of private interests in time of war with the idea of lessening the possibilities of the United States becoming involved. The theory is that more rigid laws to maintain our position as a neutral would give added safeguards against war. It might help. But unless such legislation forces all American trade and citizens to stay out of the war zones we are still subject to interference by belligerents. Our repeated protests and reliance upon laws of neutrality did not save us during the World War.

4. The proposal to increase armaments in order to advance the cause of peace ignores the basic fact that nations arm to safeguard their special interests and not to promote peace. The nation that disarms does so because there is no serious threat to its security or national interests.

5. The proposal that the United States agree not to run a blockade or violate any sanction which the members of the League of Nations might agree to enforce. If we are prepared to take this important step, then we should join the League of Nations in order that we might have a voice in determining the joint action of the powers prepared to support such a plan.

On the side of positive proposals, the following are presented for discussion: 1. There should be concentration of the departments, divisions, agencies and commissions of the Federal Government which deal with foreign relations of every form. We need a unified plan which may

be worked out through all phases of our relations with other nations. Our commercial, military and political efforts should contribute to a common objective of public interest, rather than satisfy the special group interests which exert such marked influence as at present. Then see to it that the Department of State has an appropriation large enough to meet the responsibilities and the work the staff must assume in handling all the foreign affairs of the nation.

2. The government should take the lead in determining the essential commodities we must import and the surplus goods and products we can export. Specific arrangements should be made for the exchange of these items of trade with other nations. The basis of this proposal is the establishment of international commerce upon the essential needs of this and other countries.

3. Until the United States sees fit to join the League of Nations, the government should be prepared to lay an embargo upon the sale and shipment of arms to belligerent countries. To be effective such action should be taken at the same time that other nations lay an embargo. The objections that such governmental action would be unconstitutional, a cause of war, a violation of neutrality, etc., ignore the basic fact that the government has authority to safeguard the interests of this country by preventing the spread of war, and a peaceful embargo applied to all belligerents alike can be no ground for a belligerent power to take upon itself the precarious task of fighting the United States.

4. Closely allied with this proposal are the policies of our government in the matter of international limitation of arms and the investigation of the activities of munitions manufacturers. These two policies should be supported with renewed purpose and constant support.

5. Among all the proposals for governmental action in the foreign field to advance the cause and peaceful adjustment of world disputes, I would place the adherence of the U. S. to the World Court Protocol and the membership of the U. S. in the League of Nations as the most important. The basic issue in the relations of nations is the development of agencies and procedure for the peaceful adjustment of national interests to the constant forces making for change, in such a way that each nation will experience a growing sense of order and security.

The first task of our government is to put our own house in order so that our outward thrust will lessen the friction with other nations. Then we must take that course which will strengthen the constructive agencies in world relations and curb the destructive forces which place the things we care for most at the mercy of the things we care for least. Our task is one of example which reveals the requisites of internal order and international cooperation prompted by national realities. Less "good advice" to other nations and a more intelligent study of our own shortcomings and needs is the role of the citizen.

INTERNATIONAL BROADCAST

At 4.30 o'clock in the Hall of Nations on Thursday afternoon, the delegates heard an international broadcast from women in three countries and also watched Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt and Josephine Schain as they broadcast from Washington. In introducing the speakers, who were Mrs. Catt from Washington, Katherine Courtney from London, Mrs. Ruth Bryan Owen from Copenhagen and Mrs. Tsune Gauntlett from Tokyo, Miss Schain said in part:

We believe that public opinion is a dynamic force. We appreciate that it is the sum total of vast numbers of individuals that make up world opinion. How each individual thinks and acts is a matter of great import. So we welcome this opportunity for an international broadcast to the women of other countries because their interests know no frontiers. We join today with women round the world in a plea for peace, confident that by our joint efforts eventually our cause will win—the cause of law and order on a world basis.

Atmospheric conditions prevented the delegates from hearing all of Mrs. Owen's broadcast and from hearing the broadcast of Miss Cornelia M. van Asch van Wyck, who was scheduled to speak from Holland.

This international broadcast from the Tenth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War was made possible through the Columbia Broadcasting System

WHO'S WHO

ANDERSON, MARY, Director, Women's Bureau, United States Department of Labor.

de LANUX, PIERRE, Director, Paris Office, League of Nations, author and lecturer

MORGAN, LAURA PUFFER, Special Representative of the National Council for the Prevention of War at Geneva

NYE, GERALD P., United States Senator from North Dakota.

POPE, JAMES P., United States Senator from Idaho.

STEPHENS, WALDO, Lecturer on Government, Columbia University

STONE, WILLIAM T., Vice-President, Foreign Policy Association, Director of its Washington Bureau

TOLOKONSKI, LEONID M., Consul-General of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, New York City.

REGIONAL CONFERENCES

REGIONAL conferences have been arranged in ten cities from the Atlantic to the Pacific, following the meeting in Washington. Local speakers, in addition to those sent out by the National Committee, and returned delegates will be asked to take part in a two-day discussion of the problems of peace and war.

Write to the chairman of the conference in your region for further information. The schedule is as follows:

<i>Location</i>	<i>Conference Chairman</i>	<i>Dates</i>
COLUMBUS (for Ohio, Kentucky, West Virginia, Michigan, Indiana)	Mrs. H. S. Bronson, Jr. 65 S. Fourth St. Columbus, Ohio	Jan. 28 and 29
CHICAGO (for Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, North and South Dakota)	Mrs. Henry W. Austin 1022 Lake Street Oak Park, Ill.	Feb. 1 and 2
KANSAS CITY (for Missouri, Arkansas, Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma)	Mrs. Thomas Levitt 6007 Morningside Drive Kansas City, Mo	Feb. 4, 5 and 6
DENVER (for Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico)	Miss Elizabeth Fackl University of Denver Denver, Colo.	Feb. 8 and 9
ATLANTA (for Georgia, Virginia, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Tennessee, North and South Carolina)	Mrs. M. E. Tilly P. O. Box 1, 198 Atlanta, Ga.	Feb. 19 and 11
SAN FRANCISCO (for California, Nevada, Arizona)	Mrs. Laurence C. Brown 1770 Pacific Ave. San Francisco, Cal	Feb. 13 and 14
PHILADELPHIA (for New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland)	Mrs. Frank Miles Day Mt. Airy, Allen Lane Philadelphia, Pa	Feb. 14
DALLAS (for Louisiana and Texas)	Mrs. Harris Masterson 3702 Burlington St Houston, Tex.	Feb. 18, 19 and 20
SEATTLE (for Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana)	Mrs. Harold E. Maltby 1425 33rd Ave. South Seattle, Wash.	Feb. 22
WORCESTER (for the six New England states)	<i>Promotion Chairman</i> Mrs. R. P. Nason 39 Robin Road Hartford, Conn.	Mar. 26 and 27

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

TENTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR, HALL OF NATIONS, HOTEL
WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 22 TO JANUARY 25, 1935, INCLUSIVE

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

NO. 4

THURSDAY EVENING SESSION

Presiding: Mrs. Grace Morrison Poole

THE NEW DIPLOMACY

By LINDSAY ROGERS

SINCE the Paris Peace Conference it has been fashionable to make a differentiation between the older diplomacy and the newer diplomacy. For this, I suppose, there are two main grounds. The first of President Wilson's Fourteen Points set the ideal of "open covenants of peace openly arrived at," and the League of Nations Covenant provides that treaties, to be binding, must be registered with the League's Secretariat. The important secret commitments which are now in existence are probably not numerous; even the men who negotiated them must have doubts as to whether they would be lived up to if put to the test.

Public progress toward covenants and open arrival at agreements have been attempted, but the experiences of the last 15 years have increasingly called into question the soundness of that part of Mr. Wilson's ideal. The questioning has resulted from the spectacles afforded the world by successive international conferences. Their frequency and, for a time, popularity, is the second ground for believing that post-war diplomacy may differ from pre-war diplomacy.

So far as objectives are concerned there is obviously no difference between the older and the newer diplomacy. One cannot say that the old diplomacy sought to realize selfish aims while the new diplomacy breathes a spirit of international altruism.

The popular post-war procedure has been diplomacy by conference rather than by correspondence. The experience has sometimes not been altogether happy. Conferences as a means of international negotiations are not new. Diplomacy by conference is a venerable method of international negotiations, but before the war the meetings were every few years instead of every few months. In the 17th and 18th centuries there were questions—largely of etiquette and precedence—which do not worry present day delegates in the same way. Happily the new diplomacy is freed from such preoccupations but the change is in form rather than in substance.

There is one respect in which the new di-

plomacy is new: those that give the full powers can be personally present—by telephone. Science has effected great changes in diplomatic methods. The invention of the telegraph meant that more timely instructions could be given. Now the improvement of telephonic communication has effected another great change. There will some day be a learned and informed monograph on the importance of the telephone in diplomacy. I do no more here than to suggest that it may be a curse as well as a boon.

Since the war the international problems that have had to be dealt with have been of such far reaching importance, and public opinion have been so insistent on something being done that foreign ministers have been more and more unwilling to rely on their diplomatic representatives. Nor have prime ministers been as willing as formerly to allow their foreign ministers to handle foreign affairs.

Travel is more easy now. The British Prime Minister can leave London late in the afternoon and be in Geneva the next morning. When, just a century ago, Sir Robert Peel heard that William IV wished him to be prime minister, he left Italy at once and arrived in London three weeks after the summons had been sent.

In the old days diplomats were concerned not only about the abilities of their opponents. Even more than those abilities they feared pressure from behind which might stop retreats which it was proper for them to make. But in diplomacy by conference the public is at once taken into the inner chambers. It is asked to applaud the intransigent attitudes of national spokesmen, and those attitudes, once applauded, cannot be modified without showing weakness and without admitting defeat. Public opinion works to harden instead of to dissolve differences. Hence the popularity of formulas which mean different things to their makers. Hence also imprecision and vagueness as to what has actually been agreed upon.

"Another difficulty," said one critic, "is the preoccupations of internal politics. Statesmen are constantly obliged to take positions that they can defend before the journalists who are waiting for them in the corridors and which they can defend before their parliaments and their electors."

The old style diplomats had a technique and rules which were fairly well known. They had manuals on the manner of negotiating with princes. There were guide books for ambassadors. A manual entitled "Le Parfait Ambassadeur," published in Paris in 1642, had sections on the employment of women for the advancement of the ambassador's business; on official lying, and on the occasions when an ambassador should remain sober.

We need a new kind of instructions for the use of new diplomats. In Geneva in 1927, for example, the British and American representatives read detailed statements of their respective plans for naval disarmament. If the proposals had been exchanged privately in advance of the assembling of the conference, it might have been possible to modify or at least rephrase them so that their publication would hold out hopes of a compromise instead of making it clear that modification would be interpreted as a loss of national prestige.

What kind of preparation must precede conferences? To what extent must the terms of reference be definite? If conferences are called to save the world, failure is certain. For success, objectives must be few in number and possible of realization. What is the proper place of experts? In what way should public opinion be prepared for concessions that may seem necessary? It is elementary that if an international conference is to reach an agreement, some states must make concessions. If there were complete agreement in advance there would be no necessity for meeting. But the implications of this simple fact are rarely taken account of.

The new diplomacy needs a technique just as the old diplomacy had a technique. To an extent, such a technique has been developed in the League Secretariat, but it is incomplete. At each conference technique is improvised, but between conferences it is rarely thought of by those charged with the business of espousing the interests of their governments. Armies and navies attach great importance to staff work—that is to what is called thinking in advance about objectives and about alternative methods of obtaining those objectives or, if they are unobtainable, of the objectives which will be next best. Diplomacy, however, is still largely improvised and impromptu. We have army and navy war colleges. Why not train our diplomats as carefully?

Nineteen thirty-four was a sensational year in

diplomacy In retrospect these events seem to be dire only in their threats and not in their consequences. Numerous prophets declared that an early war was inevitable. They did not reckon with the fact that Nazi Germany had thrown European states into each other's arms German policy, indeed, was primarily responsible for the hopeful event which took place just as the year was beginning; namely, the rapprochement between France and Italy Hitler was the real draftsman of the communique which recorded the recent Franco-Italian agreement

In Paris an Englishwoman who had been doing some typing for me and who had suffered from the depreciation of the pound and the high cost of living in France, asked whether I did not think that the Franco-Italian agreement "would make things better" I had some difficulty in answering her question But a meeting between two men resulted in an agreement between France and Italy. What was responsible for this agreement between two great nations?

Read the newspaper accounts of the events of these days in Rome by the correspondents who accompanied M Laval to Rome; claspings of hands; a lunch with the King and Queen; a wreath on the grave of the unknown soldier; a state dinner, a communique recording progress; a visit to the Vatican; cries of "Vive Laval;" "Vive il Duce;"—and agreement! Compare this with a similar record of an Entente concluded thirty years ago between England and France: claspings of hands; the King of England visits the theatre; the King attends a military review at Vincennes, a state banquet, the President escorts the King to the railway station!

May I rearrange the words of my subject and ask a question Is there a New Diplomacy?

THE STATE DEPARTMENT, AN INSTRUMENT OF PEACE

By DE WITT CLINTON POOLE

THE budget which has been submitted to Congress providing expenditures to be made in the fiscal year beginning next July, asks a total of \$317 million for the Army and \$490 million for the Navy, while the total asked for the Department of State and the Foreign Service of the United States is only \$12,600,000, or about one and one-half per cent of the combined amount provided for the military arms

Here, manifestly, is something wrong—\$500 million for the agencies of war, and a little more than \$12 million for the agencies of peace. Apparently we are determined to put almost our whole trust in blind surgery, to be applied after the calamity has befallen. Apparently we are unwilling to make more than the scantiest investment in that preventive medicine which some time ago was recognized to be the only sure road to health, which politically means peace

BLIND SURGERY AND PREVENTIVE MEDICINE

What We Spend for War and Peace

Appropriations by the United States for the Army and Navy During Five Years

Fiscal Year	Army	Navy	Total
1932	\$307,478,000	\$359,842,000	\$667,320,000
1933	318,964,000	218,908,000	537,872,000
1934	293,138,000	323,437,000	616,575,000
1935	255,619,000	312,099,000	567,718,000
1936 (Budget)	317,459,000	499,871,000	817,330,000

These figures are strictly military and naval expenditures In addition to the amounts shown allocations have been made from Emergency Relief Funds as follows.

Fiscal Year	Army	Navy	Total
1934	\$93,333,000	\$317,751,000	\$411,084,000
1935	5,533,000	211,000	5,744,000

Appropriations for the State Department and Foreign Service During Five Years

Fiscal Year	State Department	Foreign Service	Total
1932	\$2,592,000	\$12,178,000	\$14,770,000
1933	2,256,000	10,418,000	12,674,000
1934	2,017,000	9,875,000	11,892,000
1935	1,928,000	10,124,000	12,052,000
1936 (Budget)	2,162,000	10,448,000	12,610,000

The analogy with medicine, implied in the title of your organization, is good In medicine, we perceived, some time ago, that the way to health lies in prevention It used to be the general wont to accept disease as fate Then, in due course, the advantage of an intelligent hygiene became apparent We no longer simply prayed for health We set out instead to remove the causes from which disease was seen to come To that end we mobilized the best minds that we could find, and endowed them with the material means for prosecuting their work; and the results have richly repaid our intelligence To a great extent disease has been eliminated at its source Politics should take its cue from science and deal as effectively with war

We cannot yet be certain that we are through with war We have not yet gone far enough with prevention, and the situation is not wholly within our own control I do not quarrel with appropriations suitably adjusted to the needs of military self-defense in a world which we must recognize as still not fully civilized But I do quarrel with the disparity between the provision that we make for war and peace There is a primitive unintelligence about this, a weak submission, which would be more characteristic of emergent savages than of a people who have been able to create the otherwise progressive civilization of our day.

At the end of the World War, fifteen years ago, we had a good impulse Our intelligence and faith were stirred Under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson we conceived of a league of nations Here at last was a bold attempt to use preventive medicine The plan was not put forward as a perfected or a final measure Its authors were themselves aware that it was no more than a beginning. It was easy to find fault and make objections. So our impulse weakened. The World Court was similarly proposed—wise preventive medicine again The story of the Court and United States adherence

is sadder still, but perhaps it is coming to a happy ending now

I invite your attention to the existence of still another form of preventive medicine against war, the importance of which is often overlooked It is a preventive of great efficacy It is constantly being used, either well or ill. If its use is inadequate or ill-directed, then war can be the consequence If it is used adequately and well, it offers sound and economical insurance.

I have in mind the quiet, peaceful, daily handling of the incessant business going on among the nations, among the sovereign governments of the world I have in mind the agencies through which this vitally important business is transacted, those agencies of peace, upon which it is proposed to spend next year just one and one-half per cent as much as upon the agencies of war

In general, it can be said that each nation wants peace, but each wants it on its own peculiar terms

Out of the titanic clashing of national wills arises the vital international issues of our times These questions, great and small, make up the business of diplomacy.

Who actually conducts this business, these international relations? In the United States, as in other countries, that duty is placed primarily upon the executive, the President. The President, however, cannot discharge the heavy responsibility single-handed He must rely upon his foreign minister, who is the Secretary of State But the Secretary cannot operate unaided He must depend upon the Department of State, which is simply that group of officials who are associated with the Secretary of State in studying the swift movement of situations and events throughout the world, the part which the United States can usefully take therein, and in carrying out in actual fact the policies which are adopted and the steps which are decided upon from day to day. Finally, since the field of operation is the world, the Secretary of State and the group of assistants and advisers who surround him, must in their turn rely very largely for information, recommendations and actual contact with foreign governments and peoples, upon the world-wide net of American representatives abroad, who make up the Foreign Service of the United States

The bulk of the work of the State Department and the Foreign Service—perhaps the most essential portion of its work—is quiet, detailed and unnoticed That perhaps is why we have developed such a blindness to the need for maintaining and improving these incessantly active agencies of peace Their work is rarely conspicuous, but it is deep and always vital Ram or shine, it moves daily forward, important and petty alike, producing adjustment and good will or misunderstanding and friction, assuring peace or threatening war.

Under the budget proposals which I referred to at the outset, the Army is to receive \$48 million more this year than last, the Navy \$134 million more this year than last. The State De-

partment and the Foreign Service are to receive \$1,500,000 less than they did in 1934.

Additional personnel is needed in the State Department, but under the present budget proposals it cannot be had. It is the opinion of informed persons that, even if adequate appropriations became available without further delay, it would be almost impossible within the next five years to bring the service up to quality which the United States should have in view of our great interests and responsibilities abroad and our world-wide influence on peace.

The Department of State needs, first, to be strengthened within the lines of its present structure by larger appropriations wisely spent. Then there is a second way in which it could and ought to be improved. The existing organization of the department ought to be increased by the addition of a planning division or advisory board.

In our Navy there is a General Board, in our Army there is a General Staff, in our existing Department of State, however, no provision has been made for similar activities, or offices.

The new instrumentality which I propose would be removed from the regular channel of executive business. It would give its whole time, continuously and undisturbed, to the multiplying problems of our international intercourse. It could deal with matters which were not at the moment acute. It could examine situations with thoroughness and care, and suggest possible lines of action in given contingencies. The long rather than the short view would prevail. Our conceptions of national interest could be shaped toward prosperity and peace. It is only by some such enlargement and improvement of our present State Department that we can hope to make the best and fullest use of our accumulating experience in the conduct of affairs with other governments.

There are quite definite steps to be taken. The appropriations voted by Congress for the Department of State and Foreign Service should be watched, and the committees of the House and Senate should be addressed. Appointments to important diplomatic posts should be scrutinized. When these leave anything to be desired—and frequently they do—the President and the Secretary of State should hear from all who are interested that the United States should do its part for peace.

I propose to you the upbuilding of a stronger American State Department and Foreign Service as a definite, practical objective in the campaign for peace. You know how it can be done. Things do not happen in Washington of themselves. Both the Executive and Congress are responsive to the active intercession of interested citizens. We shall get a highly efficient Department of Peace, as the State Department is rightly called, and thereby the most effective application of preventive medicine against war, as soon as you who are actively interested in peace insist upon it here at Washington in quite definite ways.

QUESTIONS

Questions. Do you think diplomacy is more effective when conducted by principals, such as ambassadors, premiers, etc., or by a trained staff of experts?

Mr. Poole. There are two elements involved. 1. Policy is better established by the principals. 2. The execution is better carried out by trained experts.

Mr. Rogers. I agree in the main with what Mr. Poole says, but the principals have learned some lessons, for example, in the London Economic Conference, not to go unprepared to international gatherings.

Question. Where can we bring pressure to work for a larger appropriation for the State Department? Is it too late now to work for a larger appropriation this year?

Mr. Poole. It is not too late, for at this very moment the budget is before Congress in both the House and the Senate. It would be well to express interest in the State Department to the White House by letters. Interviews with your congressmen would help.

Question. Should not politics be taken out of the diplomatic service?

Mr. Poole. In the Foreign Service now there are 22 ministers who have been trained as career men, and 20 that are political appointees. Among the ambassadors there are a few who have come up through the ranks, but certainly some ambassadorships should be political appointments because the President needs men in these positions who are personally known to him. There still remains the fact, however, that politics plays too large a part in diplomatic appointments.

Question. How about Kirby Page's plan for a Peace Department?

Mr. Poole. I do not know it specifically. However, I am familiar with the proposal for a department of peace, but I do not think that there is a place, as yet, for such a department, another department would only add to the confusion.

Question. Where would a planning board of experts fit in? How could it be made up?

Mr. Poole. In the first place, such a board would have to be purely and solely advisory in its functions, but it could have great weight. In selecting men I should say a good number would be 40—men representative geographically and, perhaps, industrially.

Mr. Rogers. I do not believe good thinking could be secured by picking out a board to advise the State Department. The thinking should be done within the department by career men. Any discussion or thought should be kept within.

Question. What about the policy of frequent transfer in the State Department? Doesn't that make for waste and inefficiency?

Mr. Poole. Two transfers are possible: 1. Between diplomatic and consular service. This is highly desirable. 2. Between home service and field service. This is useful if not overdone.

Question. Will you elaborate on the statement that the State Department is a department of peace?

Mr. Rogers. The policies of government sometimes lead to war, but the foreign office through the State Department protects the interest of a country without necessity of war. If it is successful, it is a department of peace; if it fails, the Department of War carries on.

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

Presiding: Marguerite Wells

TECHNIQUE OF PROPAGANDA

By HAROLD LASSWELL

I SHALL not take time to reaffirm my loyalty to the objective of a world as free as possible from international conflicts. Rather, I speak as a specialist on ways and means of securing public action. Under what conditions can our objective be obtained?

The study of propaganda is one that we know a good deal about; we now have an army of individuals once called press agents, now called public relations counselors. Through their writings we have a vast accumulation of material on the way in which they work. We also have the records of certain congressional inquiries which, incidentally, have revealed the ways taken to secure action by congressmen. The very history of the work of church missions has also brought a certain understanding as to how to secure favorable attitudes to certain positions which are deemed desirable by missionaries. We realize the significance of propaganda campaigns; perhaps the most spectacular was the celebrated pamphlet war conducted by the Allies in 1918. Sixty-five billion pamphlets were sent over the German lines, and in some degree this probably contributed to the demoralization of Germany's fighting men.

To come to the point, let us suppose a series of objectives. How shall we proceed to secure them? May I illustrate a method for influencing votes of congressmen by some data on a

campaign once organized by the Steamship Owners Association in this country, a group of people interested in the development of the American merchant fleet. They contended that if the United States was to be safe from attack, it must have a strong merchant marine. For the building of a strong merchant marine a subsidy must be secured through contracts for the carrying of mail; these mail contracts are, in a way, gifts to the owners of steamships by the taxpayers, on the grounds of public policy concerned with the United States. At a point when this subsidy was in danger a propaganda campaign was organized by the Steamship Owners Association, later a matter for congressional investigation.

How was this done? 1. Those in charge knew precisely whom they wanted to influence and when they wanted them to act. They asked their lobbyist to make a summary of the attitudes of congressmen on all points related to their objective, they thus determined who held the balance of power in Congress, and so wasted no time on certain unimportant men. 2. Many of these important congressmen did not seem to realize how large the crisis was, so the next problem was to organize a pressure which would focus on the critical persons. A clipping service in regard to navy and marine matters was sent to the central office of the campaign; this revealed that certain parts of the country were either more hostile or less interested than other parts.

3. Then came the problem as to how to appeal to this hostile, or indifferent group (a) What are the special vested interests against the objectives? (b) What are the attitudes of sentiment against the objectives? The research bureau of the campaign then made a list of all commodities used in the construction of a naval vessel, a vast series of items. It next decided which of the constituencies which were critical points of attack were the ones that had industries which would be stimulated by the building of ships. Local releases were sent out to indicate how employment could be and had been increased by orders for commodities used in naval vessels; these releases also indicated that unemployment would increase because the United States was not interested in protecting our rights on the high seas. They next set out to appeal to several existing "sentimentalities." By this word, I refer to ideas or words which get a plus or minus response from people; for instance, the word "America" has a plus value among Americans but is not so important to Germans. The next plan was to associate the ideas which had plus value with the cause of the steamship owners, and to associate ideas which had a minus value with the opponents.

To summarize, the above could be said to be an analysis of how the minds of congressmen are made up. The problem is. Who is necessary in the securing of the objectives; who is interested in material advantages related to the objective; who is interested in certain sentimental objectives?

There is one difference, however, in organizing vote-influencing campaigns dealing with objectives of reform as compared with the kind of campaign aimed at the objective of peace. This peace objective is not to be considered as a mere series of vote-getting campaigns. In the case of reform measures there is no contemplation of a very change in the basis of civilization; nor do such campaigns attack deeply embedded practices of a whole world nor do they oppose the assumption that violence will be resorted to in human conflicts. Peace is an objective not for reform, but for revolution. By revolution I mean a fundamental change in the basic practices and assumptions of the whole world. Therefore, do not focus your attention too exclusively on partial skirmishes. It is important, rather, to concentrate on the conditions which prelude a successful revolution.

What are these conditions? We can gain much out of the history of past revolutions. Revolutions have come because millions of people have risked their lives in attaining fundamental changes in the structure of human relations. At the end of the 18th century in the name of the "Rights of Man," the French Revolution set a pattern followed in various parts of the world in the 19th century. In 1917 a new set of symbols was elevated to power out of the hopes of millions in Russia, as those hopes were skillfully manipulated.

If you examine the propaganda aspects of these revolutions you will find that they aroused the sacrificial loyalty of millions because they

A RECORD CONFERENCE

American Association of University Women..	86
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.....	41
General Federation of Women's Clubs . .	91
Council of Women for Home Missions... ..	47
National Women's Conference of American Ethical Union.	25
National Council of Jewish Women	55
National League of Women Voters.	114
Committee on Women's Work, Foreign Missions Conference of North America.	52
National Women's Christian Temperance Union	23
National Women's Trade Union League . .	17
Young Women's Christian Association . . .	136
Visitors	28
Total	715

talked the language of justice, the attainment of a social order which was just enough to die for. I am convinced that a program for peace divorced from the use of clear-cut symbols of a demand for justice is predestined to futility.

Much peace effort has failed because the appeal has been to the humane sentiment of people, urging peace as a single objective. Peace, I suggest, is something that you are willing to sponsor when you have a social order in which it is worth while to survive. The problem of peace action may not depend so much in influencing the votes of congressmen as to arousing the embattled demand of the millions for justice.

QUESTIONS

Question. Is not peace a synonym for justice?
Answer. My answer is a negative approach to your question. I would say that the word peace does not have the compelling definiteness for arousing mass enthusiasm. We must use symbols more richly laden with potency.

Question. What is the relative value of the appeal for justice and the appeal to an enlightened self-interest?

Answer. If enlightened self-interest as an appeal is related to other appeals, the desire for justice can be supported by it. Revolutions which appeal to self-interest are not so potent, people do not die for self-interest.

Question. Can we secure peace in a world founded on imperialistic policies?

Answer. 1. The problem of peace is always connected with problems of economic relationships, but peace is not contingent upon any particular economic system. Fighting existed long before any form of capitalism. 2. Even in a world of socialists states there might be great conflict between the states.

Question. Who is to decide the meaning of justice?

Answer. Each individual, and he must stake his life that he is right. We may, however, have to sacrifice a portion of our individual understanding of justice in order to make some progress toward our ideal.

Question. Would there not be a problem of world peace even though we secured economic justice within each nation? Therefore, why not support methods of adjudication of difficulties?

Answer. Yes, we would still have the problem of war, for wars have come from what one nation thought to be an insult, desire for markets is not the only cause of war. People have to be united for something and against something, the problem, therefore, is to find some symbol by which the world can organize its hatreds and its loyalties. If these symbols are impersonal, the hatreds would be relatively harmless.

World Politics and Personal Insecurity is the title of Mr. Lasswell's new book (McGraw-Hill).

THE MARATHON ROUND TABLES

By Mrs. FREDERIC BEGGS

IN the first year of the Marathons, three years ago, there were 317 groups. This year there were 437 groups. These were held in 38 states and the District of Columbia. Here are some of the organizations whose members participated in Marathon discussions.

Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Woman's Clubs, Junior Woman's Clubs, National Council of Jewish Women, W. C. T. U., League of Women Voters, Y. W. C. A. (Staff groups and industrial groups), Parent Teacher Associations, King's Daughters, Junior League, D. A. R., Daughters of the Confederacy, Colonial Dames, R. O. T. C. Units, American Legion, American Legion Auxiliary and Catholic Association for International Peace.

All nationalities were represented; members of all political parties participated, they include members of almost all churches; the average group held six meetings with an average attendance of ten, men participated in groups in nearly all the states; there were 12 registered members in a majority of the groups; almost all groups plan to continue. The members of the group represented almost as many professions as those in the U. S. Census.

These are some of the community activities resulting from Marathons. Innumerable letters to the President and to senators, over 400 groups circulated League of Nations petitions; peace rallies; radio addresses; institutes on international affairs; additional programs in clubs; current events courses; mass meetings; Armistice Day peace programs; effect on community newspapers, etc.

A group of delegates, including some State Marathon Chairmen, discussed together the problems that they had encountered in organizing Marathons. These are some of the points made in this discussion:

A delegate from Texas, perplexed by the problem of great distances in her state, urged the necessity of renewed cooperation between the state chairman and the national chairman in securing contacts with local communities. One delegate noted the increase of interest in the Marathons after a visit from Mrs. McMullen, who was on a lecture tour in that part of the country. Mrs. McMullen replied that her organization had made the mistake of not enclosing the Marathon material as part of the material sent out to the local units for their regular organization program; she felt that in another year the material should be so related. One national organization had held a model round table at the time of their national convention.

There was some discussion as to whether the Marathon Round Tables took time which should have been given in local communities to the study programs of the various organizations, there was evidence, however, that in many cases the Marathon has given added interest to the organizational programs. One delegate had had good experience in securing new leaders for the

round tables rather than using leaders from the organizations. It was urged that each member organization face its own peculiar problem in regard to the Marathons, with the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs it is a problem of the available time on the part of professional women, these adjustments can be made by intelligent adaptation of the Marathons. Another delegate urged the difficulty of getting women in the home to join a round table, for many times this group prefers a program of addresses rather than study.

The Marathon ought to be thought of as a project of the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, one delegate indicated. There was evidence that the Marathon Round Tables are helping to do away with careless expressions of personal opinion on the part of those who have no facts. Everyone urged the value of having state chairmen.

Topics for the 1935 Marathon Round Tables

The World Situation

1. The World Peace System
A critical examination
Problems before Congress which affect international relations.
2. The World War System
An historical survey
International trade in arms and munitions

National Policies of the United States Which Affect the World Situation

3. Naval and Military Policies
National Defense in the light of our political policies of
a. Isolation from Europe, b. The Monroe Doctrine, c. The "Open Door"
4. Economic and Financial Policies.
5. Neutrality and "Freedom of the Seas"

The Evolving Foreign Policy of the United States

6. Recent Administrative and Legislative Actions Which Have Affected or May Affect World Peace
This round table will bring together the summaries and conclusions of the 1935 series.

Readers' Course

By MARGARET BUTTENHEIM

WE do not consider the arrangement of this Reading Course a dull part of our program. As we inform ourselves we become a part of the drama of the evolving foreign policy of the United States. Some of the books, background material, are rather heavy-going; we also include one or two more easily read books on the same topic. It is important for Marathon Groups to subscribe to general news bulletins and pamphlets, for abstract subjects can be best discussed in terms of current events.

Here are three items which each group should have. 1. The Foreign Policy Bulletin. 2. The League of Nations Chronicle, published by the League of Nations Association. 3. Peace Action, published by the National Committee on the Prevention of War. You will find these, and many other interesting pamphlets, on the tables in the lobby here at this conference.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Presiding: Mrs. Arthur Brin

PROPOSED PROGRAM FOR 1935 *Recommended to the Eleven Participating Organizations by the Tenth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War*

Preamble Each one of the eleven participating organizations in the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War has its own peace program, which it pursues through methods suitable to its own constituency.

There is, however, a strongly marked tendency in local communities for members of the various organizations to plan for concerted efforts on specific objectives. Such cooperation gives greater vigor and effectiveness to our campaign for the abolition of war.

This conference therefore recommends that each of the eleven organizations, in so far as is consistent with its own organizational commitments, concentrate on the following practical program for the year 1935

PART I

I. Conduct of Foreign Policy

1. Support the continuance and extension of the "good neighbor policy" in the conduct of the foreign policy of the United States.
2. Support proposals for strengthening the Department of State, as an instrumentality for peace, through an increase in budget and personnel.
3. Support a study by the State Department of our policies on neutral rights, with the hope that the United States will work out a new policy which, while lessening the danger of involving us in war, will at the same time not preclude our cooperation in international efforts to suppress war.
4. Study the machinery now in operation for the ratification of treaties, with a view to supporting measures providing for more expeditious action.

II. Building Effective Peace Machinery

1. Support United States membership in the League of Nations on terms consistent with our commitments under the Pact of Paris.
2. Promote an understanding of the work and values of the International Labor Organization, in order that the United States may participate effectively in its activities.

III. Reduction of War Machinery

1. Promote a widespread understanding of the findings of the Senate Munitions Investigation Committee, preparatory to taking a definite stand on the recommendations for control of munitions interests, at the completion of the investigation.
2. Urge upon President Roosevelt and the American delegation at Geneva continued firm support of the American draft con-

vention submitted to the Disarmament Conference on November 20, 1934, which embodies a system for the control and regulation of the manufacture of and traffic in arms, budgetary publicity, and the establishment of a Permanent Disarmament Commission, and support the ratification of the anticipated treaty covering these proposals.

3. Work for such legislation as will provide that military training in schools and colleges shall be elective and not compulsory.
4. Study with the purpose of formulating a philosophy of national defense consistent with American commitments under the Kellogg Pact.
5. Initiate and support movements to curtail the Big Navy Building program, and to develop naval policies which will be consonant with our efforts to promote the use of peaceful methods for the settlement of international disputes.

IV. Economic Policies of the Government

1. Support the concept that the economic foreign policy of the United States should recognize the fact of international interdependence and therefore the need of promoting peaceful international relations.
2. We urge the study of the relations of our national economic policy and the maintenance of peace.
3. Give approval to the policy inaugurated by the State Department of negotiating reciprocal trade agreements, and urge that the policy be directed toward a lowering of tariffs.
4. Urge the government of the United States to enter into negotiations on the subject of war debts in a spirit of willingness to make substantial concessions with a view to reaching a final settlement.

PART II

Democratic Processes in Relation to Peace

- I. We, the Tenth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, affirm our belief that democratic processes are essential to the development of an effective peace movement, and as inherent principles of democracy we recognize not only the right of the individual to freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and freedom of action, but also the responsibility of the individual to exercise these rights and privileges intelligently.
- II. We realize that at the present time we fall far short of the full practice of these principles of democracy, that the civic rights of the individual are frequently curtailed and that American citizens are not sufficiently aware of their individual and collective responsibility to use the processes of democracy as an instrument to maintain world peace.
- III. We therefore urge upon the members of the constituent organizations
 1. That they protest vigorously against any infringements of individual freedom of speech or action in working for peace.
 2. That they share in the task of helping the individual citizen to form discriminating judgments, based upon knowledge rather than prejudice, and that to this end they make use of all existing channels for education, especially the school, the pulpit, the press, the radio, and the motion picture.
 3. That they keep alive in the public mind the consciousness that civic responsibility involves not only the careful choice of legislative representatives, but also the use of the vote to exert timely pressure toward legislative action which shall be conducive to world peace.
 4. That they maintain their moral and spiritual courage in the work for peace, even in the face of the most vigorous opposition.

At the end of the Thursday afternoon session pledges were secured from the delegates for the budget of the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War. About \$2,024.33 were pledged.

THE HUMAN ELEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

By WALTER W. VAN KIRK

THERE is a human aspect to the peace and war problem. This fact is often lost sight of in our preoccupation with the political and economic phases of the quest for a warless world. It might even be said that we shall never completely overthrow the war system until we take into account these essentially human forces. To be sure, we shall never accomplish permanent peace with justice until the economic system of our own and other lands is built upon something more consequential than a private desire for gain and private profit. It is also true that peace will forever remain an abstraction of poetic fancy until the world is reorganized on a political basis. These are gigantic tasks, but I have every confidence that men and nations will gradually develop a political and economic environment conducive to the establishment and maintenance of a warless world.

Our surest security against war, however, is to be found in the fact that humans are human. It is human to fight, but it is not human to kill. The swashbucklers and the heel-clickers are fond of telling us that man is a fighting animal. Maybe he is. But fighting is not synonymous with mass slaughter upon a battlefield. That is where the professional militarist makes an awful mistake. Everywhere men and women are fighting against disease, poverty, ignorance and human bondage. Mrs. Catt, for example, is one of the finest fighters I have ever known. If and when Mrs. Catt finds herself in some celestial Garden of Eden where there is nothing to fight for or against she will be very unhappy indeed. The difference between Mrs. Catt and the militarist is to be found in the fact that whereas the militarist fights with his fists, Mrs. Catt fights with her mind and her spirit.

Peace-making is not the negation of heroism. The war-maker is the world's real coward. He is afraid to fight with his mind, and that is why he fights with his sabres and his guns and his battleships. It does not take a superlative type of courage to mount into the air and from an airplane drop disease germs upon women and little children. Such action is not courage. Such action is plan, unadulterated devilry. It does not take a lot of courage for a munitions manufacturer to stay at home, and in peace and security pile up his millions while his fellow citizens are dying at the front for thirty dollars a month. We have this thing all wrong. War is the world's supreme act of moral cowardice.

It is about time the badge of heroism shall be taken off the breast of the soldier and the munitions maker and put upon the breasts of the men and women who, in this and every land, have the courage to combat the entrenched war system of the nations. The men and women who for reasons of conscience are opposed to war and who, because of this conviction, suffer

BOOK LIST

- The Backwash of War*\$2.00
by Ellen W. LaMotte (Putnam)
- Why Wars Must Cease*\$1.00
by Ten Authors (Macmillan)
- War*
by C. Delisle Burns
(English publication)
- The Two Americas*..... \$1.75
by Stephen Duggan (Scribners)
- Must We Have War*\$2.50
by Ascher Henkin (Doubleday)
- Cry Havoc*\$2.50
by Beverley Nichols (Doubleday)
- The Power of Non-Violence*... \$2.50
by Richard B. Gregg (Lippincott)
- Peace with Honor*..... \$2.00
by A. A. Milne (Dutton)
- Europe between Wars*.....\$1.25
by Hamilton Fish Armstrong
(Macmillan)
- The International Community and
the Right of War*.....\$3.00
by Don Luigi Sturzo (R. R. Smith)

In ordering these books from the publishers, please note that they have been recommended at the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War

all sorts of persecution and public reproach are daily exhibiting a brand of heroism that puts to shame the so-called bravery of the soldier who seeks to kill his adversary before his adversary has a chance to kill him.

Human nature, let it be repeated, is on the side of peace and don't let anybody convince you to the contrary. It is not human to kill. Men have to be taught to kill. They have to be fed lying propaganda. They have to be conscripted into armies and navies where, isolated from their fellows, they are schooled in the philosophy of hatred and instructed in the art of mass murder. It is human to love, to dream, to aspire, to work, to play, to laugh and cry and laugh again. It is not human to gas a man whom you have never seen, nor to throw a hand grenade into the face of a man whose little children are praying at home for his safe return. It is not human to goosestep one's way across a distant no man's land and stick a bayonet into the vitals of some mother's son. We who believe in and work for peace should be forever proclaiming the truth that men were made to live at peace with one another.

If we really believed that the human value was important in our program for peace, we would have a much better peace education than we now have. We have chased up Capitol Hill and neglected a real peace education campaign in the communities back of the legislators. We have failed to turn over the soil of the great mass mind of America. Not until we do so shall we make progress. We ought to develop a kind of buck-shot program; while we exert pressure on Congress we would also aim at the places where people live. We shall not get peace in our lifetime; it is a long, long process. If we really recognized this fact we would lay our base for a continuous system of peace education.

I have been interested in the peace poll which

is now going on in England and will continue for the next month or so, a poll directed by the League of Nations Union. This is the first time any such referendum among the people of a nation has ever been made. The conservatives and the professional military group of England opposed it. Sir John Simon said, "The question of war and peace is not one on which opinion of the un instructed should be invited."

Up to the present the vote is as follows: 94 per cent believe that the country should resort only to non-violent methods in international relations; 90 per cent are for drastic reduction of armaments, 90 per cent urge continued co-operation with the League of Nations; 93 per cent urge that profits be taken out of war preparation and war itself.

I propose that the peace movement in our own country might imitate just such a referendum on peace and war.

QUESTIONS

Question. How can we put peace education into high schools and colleges?

Answer. 1. Determine to put them there. 2. Have teachers who will not bow to powerful selfish interests in their community. 3. Help organize discussion groups either in or out of school rooms.

Question. Where can we secure material on courses for schools?

Answer. Write to any one of the peace organizations and you will receive much material.

Question. Ought we not to work with school boards?

Answer. We do not do enough of this; let us regard the school board members as our allies and work with them.

Question. What can we do about compulsory military training?

Answer. 1. Exercise influence on state legislatures urging that military training be on a voluntary rather than upon a compulsory basis. 2. Educate and influence the regents of your local institutions. 3. It is possible that Congress may consider an amendment to the National Defense Act which would change the situation in regard to compulsory military training. Study that proposal and support it if you believe in it.

RESOLUTIONS

"That this Conference recommends that the Executive Committee should urge upon the Program Chairman of the National Broadcasting Company the value of a weekly broadcast on international relations and American foreign policy, and suggests the advisability of a 15-minute broadcast every Sunday evening at 6:45 Eastern Standard Time, if possible."

"That the Tenth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War recommend to the National Committee that during the coming year it make provisions for study of the question as to the extent to which economic security is related to world peace."

"The delegates to the Conference voted to send a message from the Conference to the President and to the Committee on Appropriations, urging increased appropriation to the State Department."

FRIDAY EVENING SESSION

Presiding: Josephine Scham

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR WAR?

By HANS KOHN

WE ARE in the midst of a crisis, but it is much more than an economic crisis. It is an intellectual, moral, social crisis—a "totalitarian" crisis. I remember that my father had a feeling of security in 1910 which he certainly would not have today. We do not know where to go, nor where we are.

This is the first crisis in history which is not confined to any one country or any one civilization, it is the same in China, Russia, Europe and the United States. It is a totalitarian crisis because it includes not only every side of human life but every nation.

Who is responsible for it? Not the bankers, but we and our greediness. The system is responsible, the desire of man to get more and more. If it were only the bankers who were responsible it would be easy to remedy the situation. The crisis arises because the ideas of our intellectual and moral life are completely unrelated to the life of our times in which we see the beginnings of a united humanity.

What is nationalism? It is not merely an expression of an innate something in man for which he will kill and die. Nationalism is something that appears in the life of groups at certain stages in their development and which may disappear later as they progress. Nationalism, carrying with it the need for a strong army and navy, exists because we, the people, are full of the desire for a mighty, prosperous nation which will try to get more and more material advantages.

In every man there are two instincts, the ego instinct and the "we" instinct. I believe that the deepest and the strongest emotions are related to the "we" instinct. From early days men have been ready to die or kill for their group—family, tribe, religion, nation. This instinct to sacrifice for something greater than self is, in itself, great.

It has not been always that the nation has commanded the highest loyalties of man. Three hundred years ago men died for their religion; that, then, was the loyalty for which sacrifice was made. For it men were ready to die and to kill, yet in the next war the conscientious objector will be sent to death. It is interesting to know this change in loyalties down through the centuries. Two or three hundred years from now the fact that men have white, yellow or black skins may be quite unimportant.

Three or four hundred years ago men were loyal to their prince, not to their country; the significance of the American Revolution is that it threw out loyalty to the king and replaced it with loyalty to the country. Today the word "patriot" carries with it the idea of being "conservative"; 300 years ago it was the rebels who were called patriots.

In the history of the world, nationalism has been the greatest liberating force. Nationalism in the 19th century, a great liberating force, does not fit today the kind of world in which we live. Today it is a destructive force, for the circumstances around us have changed in the past 20 or 25 years. Nationalism does not fit a world in which we see the beginnings of the united life of human kind.

This is not a happy time, but in the midst of misery we can see certain hopeful elements. For the first time in human history the great dream of prophets and humanitarians for the unity of human kind is beginning to come through. This new urge does not fit the shell of institutions and traditional ideas in which it finds itself.

Today, for the first time in human history, the whole earth is ours; one hundred years ago Afghanistan, the inner parts of China, and the islands of the sea were nothing but names. Fifty years ago there were greater men in India than Gandhi, but we did not know them.

Today, for the first time in history, the nations are talking together. Bertrand Russell and John Dewey are better known in China than in the United States. The people of South Africa see the same film that you see in your local theatres. In a radio hook-up we hear voices from every part of the world within 15 minutes.

These radical changes are only 10 or 20 years old. In so short a time these changes cannot be expected to change our political and economic systems which date from the middle of the 19th century. The ideas by which we live are still dominated by the experience of the 18th and the 19th centuries.

Today, for the first time, the conditions for a united humankind are here. There are open doors for us all over the world.

In 1917 everyone thought that the Kaiser was responsible for the world war. Today, you may think someone else responsible for the threat of war. Hang him, and we shall have peace! It is not so easy.

THE NEW EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Carrie Chapman Catt, *Honorary Chairman*
Josephine Scham, *Chairman*
Henrietta Roelofs, *Vice-Chairman*
Mrs. William Dick Sporborg, *Recording Secretary*
Mrs. Edgerton Parsons, *Treasurer*
Mrs. Kendall Emerson.
Mrs. Frederic Beggs.
Mrs. Jonathan M. Steere.
Miss Margaret Buttenheim.
Mrs. May Bell Harper.
Mrs. Fred S. Bennett.
Miss Esther G. Ogden.
Mrs. Herbert Y. McMullen.
Dr. Grace H. Beardsley.
Miss Fredella C. Keyes.
Mrs. Leslie M. Crichton.
Mrs. Maurice M. Weyl.
Miss Louise McCracken.

All of us, greedy for money, were responsible for the last war. The characteristic sign of our present effort is a desire for more trade, more activity, more prestige, more happiness. It is we, ourselves, who must sacrifice this desire to become bigger and bigger, more and more wealthy, if we are to have peace. Are we willing to pay this price? Our political, economic and social order belongs to the past but it lives on in us.

Remember that this new growing unity of mankind contains within itself the dangers of war. One hundred years ago war between Japan and the United States was unthinkable; today it is possible because these nations can talk with each other.

It is easy to control our nationalistic spirit as long as our emotions are not aroused. The price that we must pay is to keep cool even though our most sacred goods are touched; otherwise there will be war. If a strong minority, especially women, were to keep cool in such a time, then the nation might pay the price of peace.

MOVING ON TO THE REGIONAL CONFERENCES

By HENRIETTA ROELOFS

WE used to say, "I'll meet you again next January at the next Conference." Now we say, "I'll meet you at the regional conference." Why are we having these regional conferences? The obvious reasons are that many of us in the organization cannot spare either money or time for the Washington Conference, but could attend a conference in our own region. The most important reason, however, for a regional conference is that our interests and action must be more intelligently localized. Here in Washington, for instance, we have seen our senators about the World Court; but in four states the state legislatures have, within the past few days, passed statements opposing the world court. This expression of interest in international affairs on the part of state legislatures is not bad in and of itself save as it betrays the abysmal ignorance back of these actions. Do these legislatures know about our existence? Our influence must be more localized; therefore, regional conferences for discussing how we in our own communities and states can be effective in action.

At the regional conferences we shall have demonstration round tables and addresses on the world situation in addition to our discussion of localized action. It is important for everyone here to be an emissary from this national conference to your own regional conference, for there we shall make concrete the general program recommendations to the organizations which have been made to this conference.

The Younger Generation Gets in Step

THE closing episode of the Conference was presented by young delegates who pledged to Mrs. Catt their loyalty, integrity, unity and strength, alertness and awareness, action. As Mrs. Catt rose from her chair to acknowledge the commitments of this group of young people, her arms filled with the flowers which accompanied their greetings, she challenged them to continue for the rest of their life their efforts in the cause of peace. "You may see in your lifetime the accomplishment of the objectives of this conference. The best that I can say for myself is that I have never given up in any of my causes." This ceremonial of loyalty, participated in by the younger delegates, furnished a significant close to the Tenth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War.

"WHY?"

An animated cartoon ridiculing armaments was one of the features at the banquet on Tuesday evening. Under the title, "Why?" this film was produced by a group of peace leaders in New York. The "animation" was done by Raymond Bangsbergh of the Pathe staff. Monkeys, instead of human beings, become involved in a boundary dispute and a Mr. Fox represents the dealer in armaments.

The film was designed for wide use among peace groups in the United States. Information about distribution arrangements may be obtained by writing to Good Will Pictures, Inc., 225 West 86th Street, New York.



A Dialogue

A (for peace): "For settling disputes or international problems the method of war is inexcusable."

B (for war): "But most pacifists give the impression that they care more for peace than for their country's territory, liberty, or honor."

A (for peace): "That isn't true of us. What is true is that we entirely distrust military methods particularly for the defense of spiritual things such as justice and liberty."—Peace With Honor: A. A. MILNE.

STATE CHAIRMEN—MARATHON

ROUND TABLES—1934

ARIZONA	Mrs. Nelson Berree, Box 388, Florence
N CALIFORNIA	Mrs. Lovell Langstroth, 2221 Washington St., San Francisco
S CALIFORNIA	Mrs. Charles H. Richmond, 1531 Franklin Circle, Hollywood
COLORADO	Miss Elizabeth L. Fackl, University of Denver, Denver
CONNECTICUT	Mrs. William A. Greene, 151 Four Mile Road, Hartford
DELAWARE	Mrs. William Coon, 1211 West St., Wilmington
FLORIDA	Mrs. William L. Wilson, 1406 Barnett Bank Bldg., Jacksonville
GEORGIA	Mrs. J. N. McEachern, Sr., 1715 Ponce de Leon, Atlanta
IDAHO	Mrs. Eva Hunt Dockery, c/o The Idaho Statesman, Boise
ILLINOIS	Mrs. Oscar S. Marx, Hillcrest, Mount Carmel
INDIANA	Mrs. Morwyn G. Brudenstone, 409 East 48th St., Indianapolis
IOWA	Mrs. P. L. Stromsten, 121 Richard St., Iowa City
KANSAS	Mrs. C. M. Andrews, 254 S. Vassar, Wichita
LOUISIANA	Mrs. Joseph E. Friend, 1807 Palmer Ave., New Orleans
MAINE	Mrs. E. R. Godfrey, 172 Kenduskeag Ave., Bangor
MICHIGAN	Mrs. J. R. Picon, 434 Hollywood West, Detroit
MINNESOTA	Mrs. Schuyler Woodhull, 2417 Pillsbury Ave., Minneapolis
MISSOURI	Miss Louise Warren, Johnson, 2002 Levers Lane, Saint Joseph
MONTANA	Mrs. Emory B. Pease, Glasgow
NEBRASKA	Miss Gertrude F. Eaton, North Bend
NEW HAMPSHIRE	Miss Martha Kimball, 889 South St., Portsmouth
NEW JERSEY	Mrs. Walter L. Kidde, 8 Winding Way, Vernon
NEW YORK	Mrs. Clare J. Hoyt, 95 Gladstone Ave., Walden
NORTH CAROLINA	Miss Gertrude Weil, Goldsboro
OHIO	Mrs. Miles F. Bixler, 2038 Cornell Road, Cleveland
OREGON	Miss Evangeline Philbin, 1305 S. E. Main St., Portland
E. PENNSYLVANIA	Mrs. Frank Miles Day, Allen's Lane, Mount Airy, Philadelphia
W. PENNSYLVANIA	Mrs. A. H. Bowman, 49 Sprague Ave., Bellevue, Pittsburgh
RHODE ISLAND	Miss Alice W. Hunt, 2 Angell St., Providence
TEXAS	Mrs. Harris Masterson, 3702 Burlington, Houston
UTAH	Mrs. J. J. Fitzgerald, 1444 Stratford Ave., Salt Lake City
VIRGINIA	Miss May I. Moore, 1000 Floyd Ave., Richmond
WASHINGTON	Mrs. H. E. Maltby, 1425 33rd Ave., S., Seattle
WEST VIRGINIA	Mrs. Oliver Shurtleff, 1264 Bryant St., Fairmont
WISCONSIN	Mrs. Phelps Wyman, 632 E. Lakeview Ave., Milwaukee
WYOMING	Mrs. Harriet Knight Orr, University of Wyoming, Laramie
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	Dr. Esther Calkin Brunauer, 1634 Eye St., N. W., Washington

"But war is fundamentally a moral evil. It is a disease, because it is the use of violence instead of reasoning and persuasion in the relations between men . . . War belongs to the social conditions in which cannibalism, slavery, the burning of heretics and the torture of witnesses at trials were common. The problem for us now is why, when all other diseases of society have disappeared, war still continues to be possible. The question is—What mental attitudes or impulses, commonly shared, lead to the making of warships and the drilling of young men in order to make them more efficient in killing other young men?"—War: DELISLE BURNS.

Delegate's Worksheets

Information in and extra copies of the Delegate's Worksheets may be secured by writing to the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, Headquarters, 1624 Grand Central Terminal Building, New York City.

WHO'S WHO

BUTTENHEIM, MISS MARGARET, Chairman of Readers' Course, National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War

KOHN, HANS, Professor of History, Smith College.

LASSWELL, HAROLD, Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Chicago.

POOLE, DE WITT CLINTON, Director, School of Public Affairs, Princeton University.

ROELOFS, HENRIETTA, Secretary for Public Affairs, National Board Y. W. C. A.

ROGERS, LINDSAY, Professor, Department of Public Law and Jurisprudence, Columbia University.

VAN KIRK, WALTER W., Department of International Justice and Goodwill, Federal Council of Churches.

The address of the "Friends of the Committee" of the Women's Disarmament Committee of International Organizations is 6, rue Adhémar Fabri, Geneva, Switzerland.

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

ELEVENTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR, HALL OF NATIONS,
HOTEL WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 21 TO JANUARY 24, 1936

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

NO. 1

TUESDAY MORNING SESSION

Presiding: Josephine Schain

THESE are challenging times. On one hand we face disquieting events, the war between Italy and Ethiopia with its disturbing reactions on the rest of the world; the disruption of the arms conference; the march of Japan into Asia.

I believe that a paramount issue before we women is whether the mere condemnation of war is enough. Do not situations in the world today show the necessity of going further and building international institutions which will take the place of war as a means of settling disputes?

Every conscientious citizen must be sobered by the responsibility of thinking through on all the problems the present world situation imposes upon us. One of the encouraging events of the last year has been the reaction of British and French public opinion to acts of their government in seeming to betray cooperative peace efforts. We too must train ourselves to be on the alert to seize every opportunity to weld a stronger national community.

It is most heartening to return to Washington for another conference on the Cause and Cure of War and find women assembling from all over the country. All but six states are represented this year. Questions relating to peace still continue to hold first interest among organized women in the United States as well as of the world.

It also interests me to see how persistent some of our women are in the face of discouragement in a confused world. They have been coming year after year taking part in the conference here, leading round tables and discussion groups at home, and educating themselves through reading until they have really become experts on the international affairs which shake our foreign policy.—OPENING STATEMENT BY JOSEPHINE SCHAIN, CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR

The World Today By FELIX MORLEY

THE responsibility for groups of this character, I take it, is to attempt a scientific approach to the grievous social problems which will never be solved by emotionalism of any kind.

It is not now a matter of building logically

"This program of this Eleventh Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, entitled Roads to Peace, has been built out of a consideration of the particular subjects of most importance to this group today. You will note that as the Conference proceeds the subjects move from the realm of general considerations to specifics. This program draws for us the map of the world, the world as it is and as we would like to see it."

—Mrs. Kendall Emerson. Presentation of Program

Chairman of Program Committee

on the foundations of a foreign policy already architecturally planned. It is, rather, a matter of preventing a curious and most unholy trinity of isolationists, pacifists and jingoes from destroying what progress has been made since 1918. I cite two instances to indicate the complete absence of any real foreign policy on our part at the present time. The one is the bitter inconsistency in the fact that the Congress is now simultaneously preparing to enact rigid mandatory neutrality legislation and the largest military appropriation of any peacetime year in the history of our country. The other is the incredible yet widely held conviction that if we can successfully ham-string our munition makers and pillory our international bankers we shall thereby have solved the problem of keeping America at peace.

International political anarchy in an economically unified world reached its logical conclusion in July, 1914. From the appalling desolation of the first, but not necessarily the last, World War many in our generation, under the leadership of Woodrow Wilson, drew the conclusion that some form of regularized cooperative association between the sovereign nations of the world was essential. Sixteen years ago this month such an association was launched. That is a long period in our lives, but it is a very brief span in the history of mankind. The association, however, has endured long enough, and achieved sufficiently, to make our national relations with it the outstanding "problem situation" in the world today.

You will not misunderstand me if I state my reasoned conclusion that criticism of the League is one of the most helpful services its friends

can render; I mean the really effective criticism which for some strange reason is so little raised in this country.

The primary condition of successful association is, obviously, some degree of preliminary unification among the units involved. I think that the League can pass examination on this score.

With regard to a second basic condition of human association, however, the League has not yet proved its case. The condition I have in mind now is that of reasonable uniformity among the associated members. Whether our criterion be one of physical power, of cultural achievement, of successful self-government, or almost any other standard, it is impossible to regard China and Canada, Guatemala and Germany, of Ethiopia and Italy, as sufficiently uniform to insure anything like the successful governmental union which the Swiss cantons or the American colonies were able to achieve.

For just this reason, of course, the Covenant of the League of Nations attempted only the loosest form of political association, reserving the right of withdrawal and untrammelled sovereignty to all its member states. To any politically minded person, which excludes most politicians, the form of association attempted is of absorbing interest, falling midway between an alliance system and a voluntary political confederation, such as was attempted by the constitution of the ill-fated Confederate States of America. Probably the closest parallel in history to the Covenant of the League of Nations was the Articles of Confederation between the original American colonies. Perhaps it is because the League is of such special interest to Americans from its constitutional viewpoint, that we criticize it so much.

But in spite of shortcomings and setbacks it is incontestable that the organization which centers at Geneva has been greatly gaining in stature. With sufficient perspective, that growth is unmistakable, even if we confine ourselves to the single aspect of peace-preservation machinery, which is only one—albeit the most fundamental—of the League's functions.

In 1914 and the immediately succeeding years the great majority of nations formed an instinctive grouping against a nation which, without any formal legal definition, was generally regarded as the primary aggressor against the peace of the world community. In 1931, to take the next case in which a great power asserted anarchic freedom of action, a definite advance was apparent. The aggressor was in-

dicted and found guilty as such, even though no effective restraints were placed upon Japan. In 1935, in the case of Italy and Ethiopia, the former power was not merely found guilty of unprovoked aggression, but certain definite penalties were and are being applied in consequence. There is here apparent a sequence of steady progress, the more striking because it is now a weaker League which is taking the stronger action. Again I suggest that this is due to the imperative need for a more stable world order, a need which we have reason to believe is now on the way to being met.

I do not think that it can any longer be denied that the active force behind the League of Nations is the will of the peoples of the world to achieve a security more stable than is possible from a mad contest in armaments. It is the highly natural desire to preserve civilization from collapse, nothing less, which is making a potent instrumentality out of a confederation as organically weak as is the League of Nations. Surely the most significant aspect of the Hoare-Laval proposals is the way in which this evidence of a reactionary governmental will was quickly overthrown by the instinctive surge forward of a progressive popular will, much of it coming—significantly enough—from this disinterested non-member nation.

A certain indifference to the League of Nations in this country is excusable. What is inexcusable is a vindictive attitude toward this organization and a half-concealed effort to sabotage it, such as we see today. Left to the force of circumstance, in due time the United States will work in complete harmony with the League of Nations. And part of the evidence in the case is the attitude shown by those antagonists of the League who become more bitter as they realize that they are fighting against the stars in their courses.

This technical collaboration is not at all unimportant from the viewpoint of political collaboration. What is at stake in both cases is a revision of the old concept of sovereignty. This outworn theory assumed that it was undesirable for a nation to curtail its freedom of action in any direction. The modern, and more rational, theory of sovereignty is based on the assumption that if a group of nations pool authority in a certain field, the sovereignty of each will be enlarged rather than restricted by such action.

Though against greater obstacles, our cooperation with the League has been steadily strengthening. The greatest achievement in this line was the Kellogg Pact, ratified with one dissenting vote by our Senate seven years ago. This month, which is an invaluable bridge for active American cooperation with the League. Outright consultation on political problems was pledged by the Democratic Party in its 1932 platform and did not noticeably impede the election of President Roosevelt.

Very largely as a result of this development of collaboration by the United States, the cure for war has at last come within the grasp of a disordered world. Our diagnosis shows that the

ailment resolves itself into two correlative problems of social action. One is the prevention of aggression and the other is the removal of those causes which give a certain justification to aggression. The advance on both of these fronts, through League machinery and with the cordial cooperation of the United States Government, has been much more than substantial. It has been really amazing, considering the relatively brief period since the whole idea of a league of nations was nothing more than a dream in the minds of a few scattered idealists.

The knotty problem of the judicial definition of an aggressor has been solved. And today we see the procedure of pacific penalties against an aggressor actually operative, in spite of the enormous technical difficulties which made many think that such an epoch-making step would be beyond human achievement.

Even this general outline will clearly indicate that the world, since 1918, has rapidly reached a very promising stage of effective international collaboration. This development has of late been seriously affected by the depression and by the highly nationalistic policies which are partly the result, and partly an aggravating cause, of the general economic disorder. Now, at this vital juncture, when the decision between continued progress and retrogression rests on a knife edge, comes the popular surge for a rigid mandatory neutrality on the part of the United States. I believe that this issue is of the most fundamental importance to the theme of your Conference.

In the first place, there is a widespread radical belief that participation in war is largely due to the influence of capitalist profiteers, and the profit motive. The quickest answer to that would seem to me to be the situation in Russia, where there are no capitalists, and according to my communist friends, no profiteers, yet where the national government is now arming at a pace which exceeds even the feverish endeavors of every other nation.

A second shallow misconception is the widespread pacifist belief that petitions, non-resistance and organized emotionalism will somehow discourage war. At the Disarmament Conference there were filed literally some millions and millions of signatures protesting against war. But the Disarmament Conference is none the less at an end.

A third group which lines up with the radicals and the pacifists is composed of the sincere isolationists who still believe that the United States can keep out of another world war if it only exerts the will to do so. In all our history we have had no Presidents more averse to war than Madison in 1812 and Wilson in 1917. I do not altogether agree with Mr. Roosevelt's Jackson Day thesis that history repeats, but I am sure that in the event of another protracted world war no President and no Secretary of State will be more successful in maintaining American neutrality, regardless of the legislation on the statute books, than were Woodrow Wilson and William Jennings Bryan and Robert Lansing.

Underlying the various active groups which

are campaigning for neutrality legislation is the pathetic trust of the American people in the ability of legislation to solve any problem.

The pending neutrality legislation is not only deceptive and misleading, it is positively menacing to all the constructive work of the last sixteen years in the field of international relations. It is not difficult to show that in at least three ways it actually encourages war, and war in which the United States is likely to be a participant.

In the first place, it is designed to block the collective effort to stop aggression by sanctions of non-intercourse, and therefore to make the naval blockade of an aggressor, which is a definite act of war, the only practical alternative.

In the second place, this legislation, by refusing to distinguish between the aggressor state and the victim of aggression, definitely encourages those potential aggressors against which the threat of collective action is the only effective restraint. It is no accident that our pending neutrality legislation is being received with acclamation in Berlin and Tokyo.

In the third place, by definitely opposing the United States to the peace machinery of the world, and by sabotaging our own Kellogg Pact, we are encouraging a world-wide hostility and bitterness toward this country as a blundering menace to peace. I might add, also, that the policy envisaged at the Capitol now is one which inferentially lines us up with the dictatorships against the remaining democracies in a coming struggle which may well spell finis to continuation of the system of representative government.

For these and other reasons, it seems to me that this neutrality legislation is the outstanding "problem situation" of our day. You do not need to look far to see the proof. The promised transition whereby the United States turns from cooperation with, toward opposition to, the policy of collective action coincides with Japan's overthrow of the Naval Treaty, with Russia's open acceptance of the threat of German and Japanese aggression, and with a billion dollar preparedness program which itself shows just how much real faith our legislators have in the neutrality policy which they are preparing to enact. The concept of neutrality, as Secretary of State Stimson pointed out four years ago, died when the world developed machinery for defining an aggressor state. That concept can be revised only at the cost of destroying that machinery. What the destruction of that machinery will mean is sufficiently outlined in the headlines of the daily papers.

The real motive behind our present change of policy seems to me to be a bitter and venomous hostility to the League idea, operated by a small but powerful cabal in which a majority of our people are being made unwilling tools. This attitude toward the League of Nations was conceived in hatred and is maturing in an atmosphere of vindictiveness and spite. You would not expect an individual so nurtured to turn out successfully. I can see no reason why we should expect well of a national policy with similar origins.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

The Senate of Utopia Discusses the Causes of War

Members

State of Andrew Carnegie—
 Senator E Hickman
 State of Aristide Briand—
 Senator E. Fackt
 State of David Starr Jordan—
 Senator F. Boeckel
 State of Frau Von Suttner—
 Senator B Harriman
 State of George Washington—
 Senator M. Swartz
 State of Arthur Henderson—
 Senator L Wright
 State of Jane Addams—
 Senator C Sporborg
 State of Norman Angell—
 Senator M Powell
 State of Prophet Micah—
 Senator C C Catt
 State of Robert Cecil—
 Senator Z Hyman
 Honorary Member—The Distinguished
 Miss Kathleen Courtney of Great Britain

THE speaker, Miss Catt, announces a message from the President of Utopia, asking the Senate of Utopia "to learn why war continues, why enlightened mankind did not make an end of war long ago. Especially should you inquire into the nature of the psychology which keeps alive in every nation a perpetual dread of coming war, instead of uniting earnestly to find a way to destroy it. Be assured, the hopes of Utopia and perhaps the fate of the world may depend upon it."

In a rapid discussion the senators comment on the situation. We must recall a point made by Aristide Briand, "There is not one peace for Europe and one peace for America, but one peace for the entire world." This is a challenge to us to work with other nations, together we must find the way.

The Distinguished Miss Kathleen Courtney of Great Britain is given the freedom to contribute to the discussion.

MISS COURTNEY. Hopes that she will learn here how Utopia can come in her own country.

SENATOR SPORBORG Everybody says, "It's up to the women." Men ought to know the causes of war for it is they who have been doing the fighting.

The senators note that millions of women are as stubbornly for war as are men; war is not a problem, but a predicament.

In a roll call of the senators, a list of causes of war rolls up. The struggle for economic needs; our traditional reliance on war as a method, failure to recognize the basic unity of the human race; economic disputes; war as a psychological imperative; primitive instincts—jealousy, anger, hate, hunger, fear; national pride and desire for prestige, failure to use the peace machinery intelligently, overabundance of preparation for war out of all

proportion to the needs of home defense; economic inequalities, both between nations and between groups of the population within nations, fear, lack of confidence—we have renounced war and yet increase our armaments.

This list of causes is referred to a committee of the whole after a warning by Speaker Catt that experts have agreed that it has not been the precipitating incident that has been the cause of a given war, that the precipitating incident is merely an excuse for beginning war. The actual cause of war is an accumulation of national irascibilities.

The curtain falls. Two months elapse. The report of the committee, with Senator Hickman as chairman, is now ready to be given. Senator Hickman in an opening statement gives a resume of the alleged reasons for recent aggressions, illustrating the opinion of the committee that these wars had not been fought for justifiable causes, nor for causes which the nations involved gave as the reasons for the conflict. Then follows the report:

SENATOR HICKMAN Your committee finds several causes of war of which it believes the most important to be:

1. Aroused primitive instincts and emotions—hate, suspicion, resentment, revenge, fear, greed, arrogance. With these we group pride and ambition for prestige, the will to power, the urge for imperialism.
2. The traditional use of war to which we are so accustomed that not to use it in settlement of international disputes requires more determination and use of reason than nations possess.
3. Failure to utilize the possibilities of the international machinery for collective action. Machinery which can be used to adjust controversies which arise but which can also be used, as Sir Samuel Hoare emphasized, to change conditions which might threaten peace.
4. The customary tension and critical and unfriendly attitude of one nation to another, the lack of good-neighborliness.
5. The heavy armament, which makes it possible to use war to settle international controversies. Small unarmed nations must control their passions and use their reason.

These, Madam Speaker, we found to be five important causes of war.

Three members of the Committee of the Whole considered some phase of the economic problem as an important cause of war. Senator Hyman named hers, Economic Inequalities; Senator Harriman named hers, Economic Disputes, and I named mine, Economic Needs. These three senators make a case for their position: Senator Hyman speaks of war as an instrument for meeting economic rivalries and shows the relation of war to economic depressions, Senator Harriman believes that people will fight as long as the standard of

living is depressed; Senator Powell, however, believes that contemporary economic disturbances may be incidental, that we must dig deeper into causes than is our custom.

There follows a discussion of these considerations: Russia is supposed to have a reconstructed social system, and yet Russia is adding to its armaments, indicating that they have no answer to make to the problem of war; nor can we wait to reconstruct internal economic systems before tackling the problem of impending war; and how about the pressing competition for new markets to offset the costs of huge armaments?

SENATOR HICKMAN As I understand it, there is disagreement in the world among the friends of peace. Some believe that the present economic instability in a civilization predisposed to war establishes a likelihood of the outbreak of war and creates a serious handicap in the task of abolishing war. We do not believe, however, that to end war we must first change our economic systems. That is, some believe that economic inequalities, injustices and disputes must be rectified before war can be abolished; others believe that the abolition of war being the more obvious enemy of human welfare should have first place. This seems to be the chief of the differences on this question. Therefore, I move that when our report on causes has been adopted, we draw up a recommendation to our own and all nations concerning the need of attention to the many problems involved in the common expression, Economic Causes.

Senator Hickman's proposal is accepted, and the report of her committee is endorsed.

Miss Courtney is asked to explain the "dismal failure of the Disarmament Conference." She replies that she does not assume it to be a failure, but rather, that it has not yet succeeded. The cause for postponement of even relative success is that the problem is really political, whereas it was treated as a technical problem. The conference was haunted by two spectres, (a) the French demand for security (b) the German demand for equality. Because these spectres were never laid, each successive proposal was turned down.

There follows a discussion of the weight to be given to primitive instincts as a cause of war: Does this mean that men have been fighting all these years without a respectable cause? One senator insists that our reliance on war is increasing; not until war is considered a national crime shall we do away with it. Another senator renews her insistence that failure to use already existing peace machinery is the real cause of modern war and threats of war; irritations are preludes to war only because the machinery of peace is not habitually used. Another senator draws attention to the barriers between nations because differences of culture, class and national thinking are not overcome by persistent attempts to understand these differences.

Finally, Senator Hickman closes her report with an epilogue:

SENATOR HICKMAN: Hundreds of incidents, problems and disputes have been named as Causes of War. Our investigations have led us to separate causes of war from subjects of international controversy.

A cause of war produces war. A cause of international controversy may be settled, and frequently has been by peaceful means. Two score or more such controversies have been settled in this way. They include questions of treaties, their interpretations, violations of them, even their repudiation, the rights of foreign nationals within a country, the protection of their property, damages for injury to their property, the determination of the ownership of foreign property within a state, rights of oil syndicates, concessions demanded by states within other states, the defense of political rights of minorities, payment of debts, the sovereignty over disputed territory, limits of territorial waters, delimitation of boundaries, establishment of demilitarized zones, actual armed attack on territory, armed bands crossing frontiers, determination of limits of domestic jurisdiction, the murder of a member of an international commission. Similar happenings have resulted in war. If, however, they are susceptible of peaceful settlement and sometimes are so settled, the reason for resorting to war must be found outside the controversy. Further, if a nation has pledged itself not to resort to war, yet does so, the peace case requires special treatment.

Utopia would point out, therefore, that many causes of international controversy are not causes of war but merely masquerade as such. It is Secretary Hull of our sister republic of the United States of America who says: "International controversies can and must be settled by peaceful means." The committee would agree with Prof. Manley Hudson who says: "The world is today better prepared than it has ever been before for the pacific settlement of international disputes and for the maintenance of the world's peace. Despite these facts, if nations still resort to violence, if the forces of unreason still prevail, it will not be because methods and agencies are unavailable for escape from such a crime."

(Here follows the list of causes of war as outlined by Senator Hickman's report above)

CONCLUSION: Our conclusion is that war is the world's greatest and most amazing evil, a handicap to human progress, a deterrent to friendly interrelations between the States, and the chief enemy of the human race. It is intertwined with all problems and confused with all controversies. War, however, can and should be separated from all of these questions and treated as an isolated problem. We believe that the causes we have assigned are the real reasons why wars continue. These five causes can be removed when and if nations so desire.

Tentative Draft of the 1936 Recommended Program of Work

By HENRIETTA ROELOFS

IN these conferences it has been our custom to adopt a recommended program of work which is sent to the eleven cooperating organizations in the hope that it will help them in planning their program of work for the coming year. This year we are adopting a new method for deciding this recommended program, a process in which there can be maximum participation by all the delegates in drawing up such a statement. In the first place, a committee in New York made a list of the topics which they thought should be included in this statement. The results of that discussion were sent to a group in Washington, including representatives of the eleven organizations who have been at work on the legislative programs of their organizations. The results of all of this process have been formulated in the tentative draft which will be read this morning.

This process has taken into account the following points of reference.

(a) The recommended program of last year's Conference on the Cause and Cure of War

(b) The programs of the cooperating organizations already adopted by them; this proposed draft is an attempt to secure the highest common denominator of what has already been pledged by cooperating organizations

(c) There has been consideration also of the general statement of principles of the National Peace Conference to which many of the cooperating organizations belong; this statement of principles represents in general the highest point of agreement on the part of most of the organizations concerned with peace.

(d) There has also been consideration of the program of the Disarmament Committee of Women's International Organizations of Geneva

This draft statement is being read today, it will be considered by the total conference in the Friday morning session. In the meantime the president of each cooperating organization has appointed a representative to serve on a committee which, for these succeeding days, will receive suggestions from the delegates revising, adding to, deleting, or reconsidering any of the points in the statement. This committee of eleven women will meet on Thursday night and consider these suggestions. The suggestions should be written. On Friday morning the total conference will act upon the report of this committee.

As the conference proceeds, study this draft and compare its points with the evolving program of the program of the conference. What are the experts saying in regard to the points which we are to consider on Friday morning?

COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN

American Association of University Women
Mrs Paul Howe
Council of Women for Home Missions
Mrs Francis E Pinkham
Committee on Women's Work, Foreign Missions
Conference of North America
Mrs Katherine Silverthorn
General Federation of Women's Clubs
Miss Alves Long
National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations
Mrs. Malbone Graham
National Council of Jewish Women
Mrs Maurice Weyl
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs
Miss Louise F Bache
National League of Women Voters
Mrs Cornelius Kruse
National Woman's Christian Temperance Union
Mrs D Leigh Colvin
National Women's Conference of American Ethical Union
Mrs M S. Armstrong
National Women's Trade Union League
Mrs. Maud Swartz

NOTE—Each representative was appointed by the president of her organization. Suggestions may also be sent to Miss Henrietta Roelofs, Room 840, Hotel Washington.

» » «

Questions to Mr. Morley

Question. Despite the difficulties of the past few days has not the Munitions Inquiry made a great contribution to the thinking of people about war?

Answer: As it has progressed the material produced by this inquiry has seemed more and more negative in character. It seems to me that it is more important for us to consider the conditions under which we can have peace than to consider the causes of war.

Question. If it is now practically impossible to pass legislation which would insure our place in collective action—even though we deplore some of the elements of the proposed neutrality bill, ought we not to think of it as less of a hindrance to ultimate collective action than the situation as it was in 1914?

Answer: I personally believe that the conduct of our foreign policy ought to be in the hands of the executive arm of our government. If we haven't faith enough in the existing executive arm of the government, let us get one in which we do have faith! The difficulty is that it is not practicable for Congress to legislate on unforeseeable emergencies in international situations. The present proposal is predicated on the present situation in Europe, it has no applicability to the situation in the Far East or in Latin America. It is my personal opinion that the intent of the proposed legislation is to destroy the League of Nations.

Question. What do you mean by your statement that we are in danger of aligning ourselves with aggressor nations?

Answer: Under the Kellogg Pact all wars were outlawed. You cannot be neutral in wars of that nature save as you necessarily block those who are trying to restrain aggression. You cannot have a policy of rigid neutrality for the United States and a successful League of Nations.

Felix Morley is editor of the Washington Post.

» » «

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEETS

Information on and extra copies of the Delegate's Worksheet may be secured by writing to the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War Headquarters, 1624 Grand Central Terminal Building, New York City.

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

ELEVENTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR, HALL OF NATIONS,
HOTEL WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 21 TO JANUARY 24, 1936

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

NO. 2

TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

(Continued from Bulletin 1)

Presiding: Carrie Chapman Catt

The Status of the Cures of War

By STEPHEN P. DUGGAN

IF WAR can ever be abolished, it certainly cannot be abolished by appeals to reason; it is the negation of reason. Nor by reference to ideals, in most cases its ideals are low ideals. Nor by covenants, treaties, rules and regulations, all of which will be broken when a state either deliberately or excitedly decides to fight. Nor by wishful thinking, which accomplishes nothing. The only cure for war is to determine the fundamental causes and remove them.

The causes of war may be classified into economic, political, military and psychological. These are by no means mutually exclusive but shade into one another.

1. (a) The first economic cause of war is the lack of raw materials upon the part of some of the great industrial states such as Japan and Italy. That situation is not a cause of dissatisfaction in time of peace, every country is only too glad to sell its raw materials to the citizens of other states who can pay for them. But this is not true in time of war.

The only cure that has received much consideration has been the possession of colonies. This is no cure or at best only a temporary cure. There is very little colonial space left for any improvised state. Despite what is going on in China just now, Asia is practically closed to future colonialism. Africa has been practically completely divided up already and moreover, while tropical Africa provides many valuable raw materials, it does not provide some of the most important and necessary for an individual state, e.g., oil. Finally, while the system of exploitative colonies that exists today will in all probability last for a long time yet, with growing race consciousness in Africa, it will be increasingly difficult to maintain the system. This has already been demonstrated in Asia; witness Turkey and Persia.

If the possession of colonies will not solve the problem of raw materials is there any other solution? A distinguished Belgian representative at one of the early League of Nations meetings suggested the appointment by the League of a special committee to consider the

allocation of raw materials among the different nations. His suggestion was then regarded as hopeless idealism and it was never revived.

It would go some distance to reduce the envy of the Have Nots, like Japan and Italy, of the Haves like Russia and the United States.

(b) A second economic cause of war is access to markets, a more difficult problem. Every nation is sovereign, and as such can at almost any time practically close its frontiers to foreign goods by means of quotas, exchange restrictions and the other devices of autarchy. The only solution of that particular problem is the demonstration of the futility of autarchy, and the need, in the cause of enlightened self-interest, to learn that no nation can sell if it will not buy. The chief remedy offered so far is the possession of colonies as markets for the goods of the home country. With the exception of a great dominion like India, exploitative colonies of the African varieties provide no markets of any great value; usually the population is too poor with too few wants. It is the nations with a high standard of living that offer the good markets. In almost every case exploitative colonies have been liabilities of the mother country. In the mandates of the League of Nations, there is provision for the admission of the goods of all countries upon an equality, and already the demand is being voiced on the part of the countries without colonies that the same principle be applied to all colonies.

(c) The third economic cause of war is the existence of surplus population and the solution that has received chief consideration is again the possession of colonies to which the surplus population may go or from which raw materials may be secured for purposes of industrialization. The claim of the need of colonies as outlets for surplus population or as sources of raw materials has practically no justification in fact. Japan secured Formosa in 1898, Korea in 1905 and South Manchuria at the same time. Yet in that time covering a period of forty years not so many Japanese have emigrated to those places as equals the annual increase of population in Japan proper. Millions of Italians have emigrated to the United States, to Argentina and Brazil but

practically none to the Italian colonies. The demand for colonies is animated chiefly by pure imperialism and the desire to have greater weight in the councils of the nations. That is also the explanation of the propaganda in Japan, Italy and Germany for big families.

2. The second cause of war is strategic necessity. Every country insists upon the need of self-defense. Every country is determined to have its army, navy and air force at the height of perfection, if it can. The result is a race for supremacy. There is no cure for this cause of war but collective security and the methods of attaining collective security, namely, sanctions. The application of sanctions to Italy in the Ethiopian affair is a great historical event, and if it should succeed would go far to make an imperialistic nation hesitate to violate its obligations in the future. The application of sanctions is a problem of enormous difficulty and complexity and the present experience is of the greatest value in making us aware of these.

Obtaining collective security is harder today than hitherto because of the risk of dictatorships. When the school, the newspaper, the radio and even the pulpit, in fact every organ of public opinion, are controlled by the government, no one can foretell what such a state will do. The difficulty of operating a League of Nations made up half of democracies and half of autocracies is almost insuperable. Mr. Lincoln's dictum that the United States could not remain half slave and half free might be applied to the League of Nations. The constant placing by Germany of obstacles to action while she was a member of the League has been removed by her withdrawal. Though Italy has remained in the League, Mussolini has been one of its severest critics and probably has little use for it. Finally, collective security will never be attained unless the United States is in the collection; I am convinced that the United States would be received on its own terms.

3. The third cause of war is psychological. It is a matter primarily of race and color. As long as discrimination against people of other color than white is maintained, bitterness and even hatred will exist that can easily lead to friction. The exclusion provision of our Immigration Law was a political dodge in the campaign of 1924 to capture the votes of the Pacific Coast states. It has been regarded ever

since by the Japanese people as an insult and an attempt to maintain them in a state of inferiority. It has made them regard the United States as their real enemy. As putting Japanese on the immigration quota upon an equality with all other nations would only permit 148 to enter the United States annually, it seems absurd to retain such an obstacle to good feeling.

While difference of color is often identical with difference of race it is not necessarily so. There is no difference in color between Germans and neighboring peoples, but the group in control of Germany today insists there is a difference in race, that theirs is a purely Nordic race which history has shown to be superior to any other, and this despite the fact that all scholarly research into the problem of race concludes that as the result of the great migrations of peoples, the innumerable wars and transfers of territory, and the expulsion of peoples from one country to another, there is no such thing as a pure race.

Part of this problem is contained in the minority clause of the Versailles Peace Treaty. Every student of European history knows that the nationalism of the "burned" nations in the Austrian, the Russian and the German empires was a potent cause of the World War. The minority treaties were a laudable attempt to eliminate one cause of war. But the trouble was that they were poorly enforced and that they included only a few nations. Those nations that were compelled to sign the treaties did so with a feeling of resentment because they felt that they were singled out as likely to be unjust in their relations with their minority peoples. A universal system would remove this stigma. There is not the slightest intention on the part of the nations having minority treaties to enforce them. Poland last year practically informed the League of Nations that it was going to abrogate the minority treaties.

4. That brings us to the most important cause of war, namely, the political. This is inherent in the doctrine of national sovereignty which predicates that a nation has the absolute right to decide for itself its own affairs, internal and foreign, without interference from outside. A corollary of this is that the nation must use every method to strengthen itself not only in order that it might have greater weight in the councils of the nations but to be assured of its independence and actual existence. Hence it must develop its own industries and exclude the products of foreign industries; it must secure the control of its needed raw materials, and possess its own colonies; it must try to bring within its sovereignty populations of the same nationality across the borders in surrounding countries. In other words, it must insist upon the very things that I have pointed out as obstacles to the cure of war. As mentioned already, the rise of dictatorships in Europe has made international cooperation extremely difficult, if not impossible.

It is certainly a source of gratification that

at least the first step toward some control of the anarchy of national sovereignty has been taken in the establishment of the League of Nations. The League can be strengthened only by a process of enlightenment, proving that unjustifiable national ambitions must give way to the need of international peace. With

the establishment of dictatorships, controlling the sources of public opinion, and the revival of militarism with its belief in the efficacy of force, this is going to be a slow process. Let us hope that it may be accomplished before the close of the present century and without another catastrophe like the World War.

TUESDAY EVENING SESSION—BANQUET

Presiding: Dr. Mary E. Woolley

DR. WOOLLEY: This is the eleventh birthday of eleven organizations in their cooperative venture. We have learned many things in these eleven years. These seem to me to be some of the by-products of our learning. We have learned to think as well as to feel about the evil of war. We can better discriminate between opinions, for we have heard many conflicting opinions, we are not of the group who like to take their ideas ready-made. We have learned how to work together. This Conference represents a variety of groupings with different origins and, originally, different aims; yet they are pulling together. We have experienced an increased sense of the solidarity of women.

In introducing Mrs. Roosevelt may I speak of her as the First Lady of the United States? We admire her for her ideals, her quick human sympathy. "To her nothing human is alien." We admire her for her selflessness, for her sense of leisure, although she does not practise what she sponsors! When I introduce her I introduce her for what she is. When I say that she is the First Lady, I mean first in the hearts of her countrywomen.

MRS. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

I WAS here at the first meeting eleven years ago so it is very nice to be here again tonight. I have always followed what has happened with a great deal of interest and I am always happy to know that you grow in number and in influence year by year. The more influence women have the more our roads to peace will open up.

Just this evening as I was going through my mail, I came across a very interesting letter from a woman. "You say that women should be interested in public affairs. I am a college woman, but for years I have not bothered to keep up with things as they were going on. Now I feel that I want to know a great many things I read about in the papers, but I don't understand the background because for many years I have not paid attention to these questions. Where can I find unbiased facts? Where can I get information on international questions? Where can I get lists of books? Where can I get information about affairs in my own country?"

Well, there are probably a great many women who are in just that position. They don't know where to begin if they drop their interests

for a time. The younger ones who are taking up those interests will get a much better leadership and will have more chance in their education than the older ones had. But still the knowledge of how to begin is something a great many people all over this country are anxious to get today, and this group has a special responsibility to carry far and wide the knowledge of what to read, of how to work together, of how to seek out people who might be interested and who might come and work if they were not timid or if they thought that their influence could be made to count. It seems to me that we have a great responsibility to make women really know what it means to follow any road to peace.

The other day I read that a certain question had been asked of a group of people. They had been asked if they favored, when two nations went to war, the cutting off from our country of all supplies to belligerent nations. Now remember, *all* supplies to belligerent nations. Seventy per cent of the answers said that they did favor the cutting off of all supplies. That is a very good illustration of the fact that questions are asked and answered very often without a real understanding of what the question implies and of what you mean when you say, "Yes" or "No." It is a most important thing for us really to help women clear their own minds and clear the minds of the people around them. If you want to do certain things you probably are going to pay for those things you want to do. It is up to you, up to all of us, to make up our minds what we are willing to pay, and really to know when we answer "Yes" on a question of that kind. We should try to make such questions clear and not produce an impression which won't be followed up by action.

I was very much interested in reading over tonight the questions which Miss Courtney gave me which had been answered in the Peace Poll in England. These questions really meant an expression of public opinion. Now public opinion is the greatest weapon we have, but it must be public opinion which means something, not public opinion that will say "Yes" to something entirely different from what it intends to do. This is perfectly possible if you do not know what a question means, and if you don't think through what you are willing actually to back, and how much you are willing to pay for the things that you believe in.

There is another thing that we should think about, namely, our own example, example is probably more important than any amount of conversation. We should try to make our own nation stand as far as we can for the things that we believe in, and, as women, we should try to influence our representatives by the force and the conviction of our really well-thought-out ideas and plans. If we believe that there are roads to peace which our nation should follow, we should make it very clear to our government that we want to see them follow those roads to peace. I think that we can have a great influence in preventing people from doing what I would call loose talking. We could watch our movies, our newsreels, and, if we see things that we think are conducive to bad feelings amongst nations, I think that we should register our opinion.

I had a letter tonight from a woman writing of something she had seen on a film, she wanted to know if the government could do anything to prevent things of that kind. It happens that the government can do nothing to prevent that. The only people who can do anything to prevent it are the people who see the film in the theatre. If they make a protest, if they register disapproval, the film will disappear, but there is very little use in expecting that whatever is wrong must be rectified by the government. The government is in your hands very often, and in this particular case you control the opinion in every place where that film or radio program or whatever it may be is heard or seen. You have the power to stop something that you consider harmful to the good feeling between nations.

I believe that a great deal is done by power of thought. I believe that when people think, as they often do, that nothing can be accomplished, that the world must go along on the same lines that it has gone on before, that this attitude is very harmful because it brings about a feeling of. "What is the use? I might just as well sit back and have as good a time as I can and fold my hands as far as any responsibility goes, and feel that life was made to be led as gaily as possible and that, if we have to die on a battlefield, let's go and die on a battlefield."

I cannot help but feel that we are striving as a nation now to give a good example, but we will give a better one as our citizens individually make up their minds what they really stand back of in the way of a policy to be lived up to at home, and to be followed in our relations with the rest of the world. If they really think things through, if they really work in their own communities, something can be accomplished.

I am always given the reputation of being constantly on the move; in fact, one woman, I was told the other day, remarked that she did not see very much evidence that I ever stayed at home. As a matter of fact, I believe very strongly in deep roots in some piece of

ground somewhere in your country which symbolizes your country to you, for which, if you had to die for your country, you would be willing to die, because it would picture some place that carried your memories and your associations of many years. All of us need deep roots. We need to feel that there is one place to which we can go back, where we shall always be able to work with people whom we know as our close friends and associates, where we feel that we have done something in the way of shaping a community, of counting in making the public opinion of that community. Wherever we live, wherever we are, let us put down roots. We may not live there always, but while we are there we may mean something in that community so that we may really leave a mark on the people that we have associated with, because we have stood for the things we believed in with all our might, and so we shall be a part of the consciousness of that community.

Most of us believe that roads to peace are things that we must find, that, if civilization is going to continue, we have the responsibility to find these roads. Very well, then, we must use our influence in our own communities. We can have influence in a wider way, but at least we have that one great responsibility. Where we are we must live the things we believe in, we must work for those things, we must be willing to sacrifice in order that those ideas may come to some sort of fruition.

The younger people today, I think, are doing more work and more practical work year by year. We older ones can do much to help them. Those of us who have the privilege of knowing people who have worked in this movement for years, who have known the leadership of women such as Mrs. Catt and Dr. Woolley, can do much to inspire the youth of this nation to carry on in the spirit of giving a good example through their own example in their own communities. We can inspire the country as a whole to work steadily and unceasingly against many discouragements that will come and many disappointments until we may find some roads which all of us can travel to a better understanding of each other and greater happiness in the future.

THE DELEGATES TO THE ELEVENTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR WERE GUESTS OF MRS. ROOSEVELT AT TEA AT THE WHITE HOUSE ON WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, JANUARY, 21, FROM FIVE UNTIL SIX O'CLOCK.

» » « «

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEETS

Information on and extra copies of the Delegate's Worksheet may be secured by writing to the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, Headquarters, 1624 Grand Central Terminal Building, New York City.

CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

I HAVE been celebrating of late an anniversary for I was recently reminded that I began work for woman suffrage fifty years ago. Now no one likes to hear of another person's experience, but I give you my solemn word that there is such a difference in the way the world thinks of many things now as compared with fifty years ago that it is almost impossible to believe it, and so I would like to bequeath to you two ideas which it has taken fifty years to get into my head. Investigate these, prove them, and you will be worth one hundred per cent more than you are now!

In the first place, no reformer was ever surprised by hearing news of the victory of his cause before its time. Every good cause has come to its victory much overdue. When someone invents an automobile, people give up horses over night. But if someone urges us to give up coffee for breakfast, we rebel for that new idea means that something will be taken away from us. Thus it is with the cause to do away with war. We know that our cause will prevail as certainly as the sun will rise tomorrow. We just don't know the date, that is all. I know many young and earnest advocates of peace who are now in despair because of the rise of dictatorships in parts of the world. These men are in despair because they do not realize that their cause will take time and so, in their despair, they are unfit to do their best work.

The second point is this: When I went into the suffrage movement and went to the first convention I was not pleased with it because it was so complicated. At that time woman's suffrage was as complicated as war is today. For a long time it was impossible for women to pick out of their many deprivations grievances of custom and distinguish them from grievances which could be met by legislation. So I asked myself how reforms had got ahead.

This is what I found. However complicated a cause is in the beginning, day by day the one fundamental idea drops the complications behind and appears simple to those who espouse the cause. There are many roads to peace now, but in the end it will be one road, and when the cause becomes simple it will be near the moment of its triumph.

Don't make war respectable by giving it complicated reasons for its existence. War has no right to be in this world. War must go, and when it goes some of the complications about which we think so much today will go with it.

Think about these points. Believe them if you can.

MISS KATHLEEN B. COURTNEY

YOU will forgive a British woman speaking tonight for saying first of all one word about the death of King George. It would be impossible to address an international meeting tonight without making one reference to that event and without perhaps casting a glance back to the twenty-five years during which King George has reigned, because I suppose those twenty-five years have been more fraught with change, more fraught with events of consequence to the world, than perhaps any twenty-five years one could pick from history. During all those years it is no exaggeration to say that our late King, always an indefatigable worker, always faithful to his duty, has invariably stood for peace and for good relations between the nations. He is a great loss to our people; I believe that he is a great loss to the world. We look with confidence to his successor to carry on the kind of example which his father has set. Forgive me for saying these words which come from the heart.

(The audience stood in reverent memory of King George V.)

In January 1930 it was only about eighteen months after the Kellogg Pact had been signed. We were full of hope. War had been renounced; peace was in sight. A naval conference was sitting. Here is coincidence—that the naval conference is sitting now. But what a different naval conference! We were then looking forward to a disarmament conference, and our hopes were high that a great reduction and limitation of the armaments of the world was to take place.

What do we see today? A disarmament conference which, if it has not dismally failed, certainly has not succeeded, and which is now in abeyance. Has war, indeed, been renounced? Since 1930 wars have taken place. In 1936 a war is taking place. Are we to say, then, that we have gone backwards?

I am not downhearted. I do not think that we have gone back. I think that we are going forward because public opinion knows what it is up against, because we have stopped thinking that we only have to say that we renounce war and it vanishes.

What is the situation? The world is in transition. It is not so easy for age-long ideas, age-long customs, age-long traditions to be uprooted. They are not uprooted in our own hearts and minds. Ask yourselves, my friends, can you say, each one of you, that it is so easy for you to adopt the new ideas of the new order? The risks of peace are just as great as the risks of war, and for some strange reason, people are less willing to take them, less willing to face the unknown risks of peace than to face the known and horrible risks of war.

I want to speak of how public opinion operated in the present tragic war between Italy and Abyssinia. In talking of that war as an example of the transition between the old order and the new, I am not forgetting that it is a

war, I am not forgetting, as Mr. Eden said in Geneva, that while we talk people are being killed, I am not forgetting all that when I say that the Italo-Ethiopian war seems to sum up all that represents this transition period, this conflict between the old order and the new.

People often say to me, "Really, what right have you to find fault with Italy? She is only doing what Great Britain has done scores of times, and when Italy comes in and does it, it is a little mean of you to find fault with Italy."

Well, it may be hard on Italy to find herself in the new order when she wants to grab something, but we have got to face facts. The Covenant of the League of Nations exists, and Italy has signed it. We have passed over from the grabbing period to a period when, if you want something, you have got to get it some other way than by grabbing. That may be hard on Italy when she is in a grabbing mood, but it is the fact, and there you have your transition.

The other thing that makes this conflict so extraordinarily instructive is the way in which it has been affected by public opinion, because that is something new too. Read the novels of Jane Austen and see how little attention was paid to the wars that were going on all over the world at that time. But now public opinion is deeply, intimately concerned with war. I speak from the angle of Great Britain and I want to discuss the way that public opinion has operated in regard to this war.

To begin with, I must go back to what we call in Great Britain the Peace Ballot. About eighteen months ago we started in Great Britain to get a sort of voluntary plebiscite of the people as to their views upon disarmament and the League of Nations and we were amazingly successful. We got between eleven and twelve millions of people to answer the questions which were put to them.

There is no doubt whatever that the knowledge that the great mass of the people were behind, or would be behind, the government in supporting the League of Nations, deeply affected the policy of our Government in relation to that dispute, and, I believe, caused the history of the League and of Great Britain to be a different history from the history of the Sino-Japanese dispute and the Manchurian question.

Another thing that people always say is, and I expect a great many people in this room are thinking it, "Well, the League did not interfere between China and Japan, so why should it interfere between Italy and Abyssinia?"

Supposing that last Tuesday your courage had failed in jumping into the water to save a drowning child, and supposing that next Tuesday there is a drowning child in the water and your courage does not fail, what will you say if somebody on the bank says, "But last Tuesday you didn't jump in, so why do it today?" That seems to me to be the attitude of mind of those people who say, "You made

a mistake in 1931 so for heaven's sake go ahead and make it again. What we say is, because we made a mistake in 1931 and learned from it, we jolly well do not mean to make a mistake again.

There is another thing I have heard, and that is that this business about the League and Abyssinia is entirely inspired by British imperialistic signs of a mysterious kind. I do not know exactly what imperialistic means, but it is a very convenient word to cover a multitude of sins, and it is these sins which we are supposed to be committing again under the guise of supporting the League of Nations.

Friends, let me say from the bottom of my heart, that you make a profound mistake if you really think that the attitude of the nations of the League, including Great Britain, is an attitude inspired by imperialistic motives.

If any of you had been in Geneva last September and October you would have realized how absurd it is to suppose that imperialistic motives played a major part. Do you reckon Switzerland as imperialistic? What about the Irish Free State? Is that an imperialistic country? The smaller countries of the League showed most clearly and in an unmistakable way that they regard the League of Nations as the guarantee of their security. Those were solemn days that we lived through. Responsible representatives of nations there bound themselves to support the Covenant. They did it knowing that it was going to mean sacrifices, and they did not do it at the bidding of imperialist Great Britain, France or any other imperialism. They did it because they believed that the League of Nations was their hope of security and, to some of them, the very guarantee of their existence. We make a great mistake, we misread the situation if we see in it only the play of ancient and indeed worn-out so-called imperialistic designs and motives.

All through the earlier months of 1935 there was a steady pressure from organized opinion in my country for a League solution of this conflict. The culminating point, perhaps, in the expression of British opinion, was the speech made by our then Foreign Minister, Sir Samuel Hoare at Geneva, when in most unmistakable terms and in terms which Great Britain had never used at Geneva before, he spoke of the intention of Great Britain to support the League, and of Great Britain's intention to resist by collective means all unprovoked aggression. It was a great moment, because my country is always accused of being unwilling to commit itself. It may not be an altogether unfamiliar accusation, perhaps, in this country. Perhaps we are alike, we Anglo-Saxons. Perhaps we all dislike committing ourselves. We have really more confidence in our ability to deal with a situation when it arises than confidence in our power to foresee what kind of situation will arise. There are people in Great Britain who would like to see other Anglo-Saxons more willing to commit themselves!

But what a curious thing happened! France, which had been pressing us ever since 1919, in season and out of season, to commit ourselves in some way or another, and who had at last got what she wanted, was not at all pleased with it. A most unhappy, a most embarrassed M Laval, a most disgruntled French Prime Minister had to drag himself to the platform in order to say that he agreed with Great Britain—this instead of those poems of joy which we might have expected a little time before.

You see, that comes perhaps of waiting too long to commit yourself, and maybe—maybe—you will have the same experience. Perhaps when you expect to see us all shouting for joy, you will see a reluctant Foreign Minister getting up and saying, "Well, I do agree."

And then you know what happened. Italy went to war. The war was not prevented, and so people say, "The League has failed because war has taken place," but the League has not failed. It is impossible for the League, which after all is made up of the members which compose it, to prevent one of its members from going to war if it is determined to do so. The League has not failed, although Italy has gone to war.

I wish you could have been present at those meetings in Geneva. For the first time in its history the League was going to have to apply that Article XVI of which we have heard so much, that article which lays down the measures which are to be taken by the other nations if one of their number is declared to be an aggressor. Would it work? To take economic measures against another nation, to withhold loans and credits, to refuse to accept its imports, to refuse to send to it certain exports, demand great sacrifices. Have you sufficiently realized what that means to some of the nations of Europe? I am not speaking for the moment of my own country; I am thinking of other nations whose economic position is precarious enough and who do not know when the storm is over what damage is going to be done or to what extent it can be repaired.

Do you not think it spoke a good deal for the solidarity of the League that within a very few weeks, in spite of all the complications involved, fifty-two nations had agreed to put an embargo on the export of arms to Italy, fifty had agreed not to accept Italian imports, and fifty had agreed to withhold certain exports, certain raw materials and goods from Italy? Do you not think that it says a good deal for the power of the League and for what it means to the nations which belong to it that that number of nations were found to face the sacrifices, sacrifices that they made because they believe that their safety, the safety of the world, did depend upon not letting aggression pay, because they felt that what was at issue was the whole League system? It was not just a war in savage Africa, it was a conflict between two systems, the new and the old, and these nations were determined that the new should win.

The Distinguished Miss Kathleen B Courtney of Great Britain is Honorary Secretary of the British Women's Peace Crusade, and came to the United States this month especially to attend the Eleventh Conference on the Cause and Cure of War.

And what happened next? Another uprising of public opinion—one of the most remarkable that has ever occurred. Sanctions were working slowly, partly because certain of the goods and raw materials which are necessary for carrying on war had not been included in the list of those prohibited for export to Italy. Oil had not been cut off. Why? The official reason was that there were nations outside the League which could easily supply Italy with all the oil that she wanted, so what was the use of cutting her off from the supplies of nations within the League? That was the official reason.

What was to happen next? What happened with those extraordinary peace proposals called the Hoare-Laval proposals which have already been alluded to in this conference? It is impossible to conceive a more vehement expression of public opinion than was made in Great Britain during those ten days. First of all, surprise and incredulity gave way to indignation and determination that these peace proposals should not be permitted to carry on.

In the House of Commons at that celebrated debate, that unforgettable scene when Sir Samuel Hoare resigned, Mr Baldwin used these words. "I was not expecting that deeper feeling which was manifested by friends in many parts of the country on what I may call the ground of common sense and honor. The moment I am confronted with that I know that something has happened that has appealed to the deepest feeling of our countrymen, and that some note has been struck that brings back from them a response from the depths."

Now that was public opinion and it worked in ten days. That government of ours which had got an enormous majority in the House of Commons had to give way, had to abandon the peace proposals. It had to declare that they were dead.

Well, what next? The war is going on. We want to stop it. How is public opinion going to work to stop it? I think that is a hard task. I think it has got to be done in Europe through the League of Nations. I think that as far as Great Britain is concerned our people have got to be kept informed of the situation by the organs of public opinion, by the organized societies, and to be encouraged to carry on with the good work, with the determination to see that whatever happens aggression shall not pay—the determination shared by other

nations in the League that a country shall hesitate before it embarks upon what has been proved to be an adventure, an expensive, a tragic adventure which has brought with it no fruits. That is what we want to prove war to be.

It is not enough to stop the war, we want to prevent war. It is only when war can be prevented that we are really on the highroad to peace. We must think out a whole peace system; we must be sharers in the building of the world community. That is really the only sure road to peace—a firmly built and well-founded world community. It is as builders, as servants of the cause of building that world community that I speak to you. Do not let us forget as part of that building the importance of disarmament. It is rather the fashion nowadays to put disarmament on one side and say that it is something that is old-fashioned or off the map or that it can not be considered now while a war is going on. But we shall not get peace without it.

And then just one more thing. Let us not be lazy-minded. It is a great temptation to human beings. It is very difficult not to be. I was reading the other day an article written by an English novelist, appealing to the women of the world: "Know! Know! Know the facts and then use the facts." Public opinion is useless if it is fluffy and woolly. It has to be a definite, precise public opinion that knows what it is talking about and that cannot be out-faced by the next person around the corner who does know something.

Know! And to know you have got to be in touch with sources of knowledge. You have a great organization here, a great manifestation of the solidarity of women, the solidarity of American women. It is a marvelous organization, this. But there is another solidarity that is worth while, perhaps even more worth while, that you can build upon the solidarity of American women, and that is the solidarity of the women of the world. Men and women must work at this thing together, but perhaps women look at it from a slightly different angle, and because women have got their organizations well started, it is worth while for their organizations to combine. We have started in Geneva, as you know because you are represented on it, a committee of all the women's international organizations which tries to serve by bringing to bear upon the organs of the League the views and the opinions of the women of the world on the one hand, and on the other tries to send back to the organizations of women the information which they need if they are to have that knowledge without which they lose half their power.

Will you not support your own organizations, support this great testimony to the solidarity of American women, and support, too, what we want to make a great testimony to the solidarity of the women of the world, a great testimony to the power of public opinion, the only power in the world today that can really not only stop war, but prevent war?

WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

Presiding: Mrs. Daniel O'Day

BUSINESS

Report of Committee on Public Relations:

Mrs. F. S. Bennett

OUR objective, as we have been told by speakers at this Conference, is not merely the education of those of us who have come here for eleven years, but rather the education of the last woman in the smallest village. This committee for which I am reporting is organized to help you carry on real publicity for our program. Let us know whether the material we make available is of value to you.

The office of the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, 1622 Grand Central Terminal Building, New York City, sends out many special releases. You will have seen some of them. We are also preparing an article on the techniques of peace publicity, you have already seen our Peace Glossary. We are beginning to prepare short radio talks for your use. There are six topics, with three talks on each topic, each of varying length. The World Court, Disarmament, An International Police Force, The Attitude of Various Presidents of the United States on Neutrality, Neutrality, The History of the Peace Organizations in the United States. If you will write to us, the committee guarantees to provide radio speeches on other topics in our field. We are also preparing a new pamphlet on the origin and history of the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War.

Report on Press Project: Mrs. May Bell Harper

THIS committee is asking you to perfect yourselves as writers on world peace. Use your opportunity to influence opinion in our communities by getting access to your own home newspapers. Get acquainted with your editor; show him such publications as the Foreign Policy Association *Headline Books*, tell him how many women will be interested in his comment on them and on his editorials in the field of our interests. Get women to write letters to editors. You will see an exhibit of such letters in the lobby.

Report on Marathon Round Tables: Mrs. Frederic Beggs

THERE is a rise at present of more than 50 per cent over 1934 in the number of Marathon Round Tables. Reflecting a greater interest in international economics and politics, the Round Tables, local units which study international relations and national policies and make decisions on the causes and cures of war, have increased to 739. In the year 1934 there were

437. Material and guidance are furnished by the National Committee.

The number of round tables by states are as follows. Arizona, 6; Arkansas, 2; California (N), 16; California (S), 35; Colorado, 45; Connecticut, 28; Delaware, 2; Florida, 7; Georgia, 9; Illinois, 35; Indiana, 48; Iowa, 9; Kentucky, 1; Louisiana, 1; Maine, 7; Maryland, 3; Massachusetts, 14; Michigan, 76; Minnesota, 36; Mississippi, 2; Missouri, 22; Montana, 2; Nebraska, 5; New Jersey, 63; New York, 48; North Carolina, 7; Ohio, 40; Oklahoma, 2; Oregon, 17; Pennsylvania (E), 25; Pennsylvania (W), 15; Rhode Island, 13; Tennessee, 4; Texas, 24; Utah, 6; Virginia, 18; Washington, 11; West Virginia, 4; Wisconsin, 14; Wyoming, 9; District of Columbia, 6; Hawaii, 2.

Nearly 40 per cent of the groups organized by member organizations of the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War are organization groups. The rest are mixed groups representing several organizations. The membership of the groups represent a great diversity of race, creed and opinions. Some are college graduates and some are not. Professional groups, business men, club women and business women are actively interested, the professional groups being largely represented.

Comments are generally favorable and criticism constructive. The material is described as excellent, helpful, interesting, conducive to thought, timely, abundant, worthy of six months' study, the questions provocative and the course valuable and very worth while. A number of groups feel that some simpler material should be provided for new groups with little background or for those groups which have little time for study and yet are interested. It is the feeling of several that some material of this sort must be arranged before the average public can be reached. One group suggests a simple basic pamphlet around which the course might be built up. The Marathon Movement during the year ending January 24, 1936, has shown steady growth, a lively interest and a marked vitality which holds promise for the future.

Introduction

Josephine Scham introduced to the delegates the following guests of the Conference: Mrs. Albert N. Connett, president of the European Federation of the American Woman's Clubs, Miss Mary McGeachy, of the secretariat of the League of Nations, Information Section, charged with liaison with Canada and with international women's organizations in Geneva; Lady Zimmern, Honorary Secretary, Geneva School, International Studies; Miss Mary Dingman and Madame Clara Guthrie D'Arcis, president and treasurer, respectively, of the Peace and Disarmament Committee of the Women's International Organization at Geneva. (Miss Kathleen D. Courtney is vice-president of this same organization.)

Economic Adjustments in Time of Peace

By THOMAS J. WATSON

WORLD peace is essential to world prosperity. Both depend upon economic adjustments in time of peace.

We are living in stirring times. We have seen many institutions, once regarded as the better product of modern civilization, torn from their moorings by mighty social and economic forces with which nations seemed unable to cope. These world conditions should cause business, financial and political leaders, of all countries, to realize that intense nationalism must give way to a frank recognition of the interdependence of nations. And these industrial, financial, and political leaders must realize, also, that their dealings, nationally and internationally, must be tempered with a greater degree of cooperation and fairness than the world has ever seen.

There are certain basic problems which, I believe, are vital to the peace and security of the world. They relate to adjustment of international trade barriers, international stabilization of currencies, settlement of international debts, and international agreement on armaments.

Adjustment of Trade Barriers

We can not hope to raise living standards in any part of the world through a plan of economic scarcity imposed on the people of other countries. I am not an advocate of free trade, although I believe that the need of high tariff protection in this country is, in many cases, overrated.

A reasonable adjustment of trade barriers to promote exchange of goods and services among nations will prove a great benefit to the cause of peace.

Stabilization of Currencies

International stabilization of currencies is another necessary economic adjustment that can be made only in time of peace. World trade is hampered by the fluctuating values of national currencies. We must remember that stabilization of currencies must be on a basis that is as fair to one country as it is to another.

Settlement of International Debts

International debt constitutes another problem tied in with world trade barriers and currency stabilization. And these debts must be settled on a basis fair to debtor and creditor alike.

Agreement on Armaments

The armament programs of many nations are excessive burdens on taxpayers. They divert funds from uses which would better promote living standards of those nations. Through international agreement, the competitive race to provide weapons of destruction can be controlled.

The International Chamber of Commerce and the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace are jointly directing a world economic survey. Consideration also will be given to world supplies of food and clothing and requirements of raw materials. An effort will be made to ascertain the economic effect of war both upon nations engaged in it and others affected by the financial and commercial stresses of war. To facilitate this work, the two organizations plan to provide a Fact Finding Council made up of a committee of four in each country, two representing industry and two the cause of international peace.

National Problems

Peace and harmony at home are essential to sound economic adjustments. We must have honest cooperation among industry, labor, finance and government. Our motto must be "A fair deal can not injure anyone." We must take the good of the so-called "old order" and the good of the so-called "new order" and weld them into policies which can be agreed upon as being in the best interests of all our people.

Importance of the Press

A free press is vital to progress, and leaders of American journalism have been vigilant in maintaining the freedom of the press. The press should always exert its influence for good in promoting sound consideration of all our problems.

This is an opportune time for this organization, devoted to the cause of peace, to push forward its program. The adjustments necessary to attain peace lie within the power of the peoples of all nations.

During peace time, we must build up the farthest cooperation and strengthen all relations, nationally and internationally, to the end that we shall promote security and accord among nations and thereby contribute to the peace, happiness and prosperity of mankind.

The Interrelations of Political and Economic Security

By CHARLES G. FENWICK

THE most formidable problem of international relations at the present day is the anarchy resulting from the system of individual national armaments. Down to the time of the World War each state was dependent upon its own resources for the defense of its territory and its interests. There were alliances and counter-alliances by which two or more states sought to protect themselves against other states, but there was no sense of collective responsibility on the part of the community of nations as a whole for the maintenance of peace, and there was no system of cooperative defense by which individual nations less adequately armed might depend upon the whole community to protect them against an aggressor. The re-

sult was a competition in armaments which was directly provocative of war. On occasion, states even believed themselves justified in attacking another state as a measure of self-defense against a possible future attack upon themselves under less favorable circumstances.

Under such a system it was inevitable that the leading nations should undertake to assure themselves adequate supplies of arms and ammunition in advance of the outbreak of war. If they could not manufacture them in sufficient quantity at home, they relied upon their navies to enable them to import what they needed from other states. If they were deficient in the key raw materials of industry they directed their policies to keeping open the channels of trade and to building up reserve supplies upon which they could draw in emergencies. A high degree of productive efficiency at home and the possession of colonies and dependencies abroad were both conditions for the maintenance of efficient armies and navies.

Into this anarchy of competitive armaments another vital factor entered. The latter half of the nineteenth century witnessed the rapid development of many states from an agricultural to an industrial regime. This process of industrialization was accompanied by a keen competition to obtain foreign markets in which manufactured products might be sold and an equally keen competition for supplies of the raw materials essential to the maintenance of industrial activity. This industrial rivalry led in turn to restrictive policies by which states sought to improve their balance of trade by closing as far as possible the door of their home markets to goods from other countries while seeking to secure monopolistic markets in undeveloped countries under their control. So keen did the rivalry become that it was soon evident to the leading competitors that larger armies and navies would be needed to protect their economic interests against rivals who might seek to use force to gain an advantage.

At this point the question might be raised whether the reliance upon individual armaments for national defense was responsible for the economic rivalries of the nations, or the economic rivalries were responsible for the armaments. The truth probably is that, whichever came first, each was soon a contributing factor to the development of the other.

What constructive measures must be taken to remedy this situation? In the first place, it would seem essential that some system of collective security must in time replace the present system of individual national armaments. We may concede that any plan of cooperative defense presents serious difficulties. But whatever the difficulties, collective security is the one feasible plan for effective disarmament. In the second place, it is equally important that plans of collective security or cooperative defense must be accompanied by plans for the adjustment of international economic rivalries. Economic disarmament must go hand in hand with military disarmament.

It is clear now that the reason for the partial failure of the system of collective security set up by the League of Nations was that it made inadequate provision for the improvement of the economic conditions that give force to the demand for military armaments. Collective security is indeed the primary condition of international peace. But if collective security is to mean the maintenance of an unjust status quo, sooner or later the nations which are handicapped by the status quo will break through the restraints of the law.

We have concentrated our attention too long upon the mere repression of violence, important as that task is if other problems are to be solved. We have not concerned ourselves sufficiently with the problem of international justice. The great objective now before us is to work out the conditions of a stable economic order, to attain that order the more highly favored nations must be willing to pay a price for peace.

United States' Responsibility for Peace Machinery

By JAMES T. SHOTWELL

AS AN historian I am not too much interested in an overemphasis on the causes of war. I have seen wars that did not happen! There was one instance when Russian ships sank some British fishing fleets in northern waters, at that time the Russian Bear was the bogie of English schoolboys. But some experts were invoked who met in Paris and settled the affair. The cure was the thing that made the cause no cause. I recall that all Europe thought that the United States was about to go to war with Japan immediately after the World War. Well, it did not happen.

But the cure must be injected at the proper time; the causes in that case are merely irritants which precede the application of the cure. Remember, too, that the cures must be pertinent to the causes. The causes are often irrational; therefore purely rational solutions may not suffice. As an historian my business is to consider causes, yet I see that the popular interest in causes of war is too often because they can be said to be a responsibility of someone other than ourselves.

Now what can we do about all this?

1. We have tried to throw everything back on our reliance on the public opinion of the world. Yet when and where has public opinion ever been effective without a mobilizing arm and leadership, without concentration toward a definite point of action? We need ways by which we, ourselves, can feel part of the public opinion of the world; only so shall we think that it amounts to anything. "The public opinion of other countries," said a newspaper editorial writer of the Hoare-Laval incident, "is for the first time affecting the public opinion

of France" This was because it was directed toward a single objective

2. Then there is our dependence on the "cooling off" element of the Bryan treaties This device, calling for delay in order to get at facts before going to war, is a sound idea. The Bryan treaties, however, lack a cohesive force, a continuous organizing agency

3. How about our arbitration treaties? Because of the fact that all treaties have to be acted upon by the Senate we have at present only a few fragments of devices leading to arbitration, with the Senate complication these treaties are weakened by their indefiniteness

4. Then there is the effort to establish a World Court. It must be pointed out that the Court is not a substitute for other things, the fact that we have not entered it is not, in my opinion, save for its implications, a vital loss for peace. The cases that go to it are not ordinarily peace and war cases. It is political disputes over which nations fight, and these are ruled out of the Court procedure.

5. Where are we in our progress toward international organization? Today there is a recession of interests in the League of Nations. That withdrawal from a desire to participate in the League of Nations has been induced by some causes of our own belligerency which might well be stated here.

a. One of these causes is the insistent prophecy of war. The picture of the world is painted for us as so unlovely that no United States citizen cares to be a part of it. These prophecies of war have now been put on the air, and are doing terrible damage to the public opinion of this country by their constant insinuations that other nations are devious and malevolent.

b. Then there is the recurring belief that war is coming because of the injustices of the Versailles Treaty—the Have-Nots vs the Haves thesis. There are injustices in that treaty, but look at the injustices of the Hapsburg, Hohenzollern and Romanoff régimes which were done away with by the Versailles Treaty. Do not succumb to the propaganda of a victim of this Treaty without discriminating thought. The Germans naturally put the blame for their conditions on the Versailles Treaty; the other parties to the War put the blame on the War itself.

How can the League of Nations take on this difficult task of securing social and economic justice throughout the world? In considering this we must understand what *kind* of problems can be tackled by it. Before you speak hastily, consider that you are asking for the hardest thing possible in assuming that the League can deliver to one nation territory owned by another. How would we like to give back to Spain territories once owned by that country in the United States? It is easy to ask another country to give up its territory. Yes, we must hope that the frontiers between European countries will be less of a barrier between international understanding; this must

go beyond a revision of tariffs and include all sorts of communications. We shall have to consider seriously some of the many proposals for redistribution of raw materials. We must certainly concentrate on building an international organization.

These questions are now before the League of Nations. Those who stand back and think that neutrality will solve these questions, that high tariffs are a good thing, will carry us down the slope toward destruction. The only hope for the world is as we all assume that our highest interests are consonant with the interests of others

» » « «

Questions to Mr. Watson and Mr. Fenwick

Question. What are your hopes for ever getting a world government?

Answer. I believe that we are making great progress. Look back thirty years and think of the ideas and principles current today which were not even considered thirty years ago. It is this fact that gives us assurance.

Question. Would it not be a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul if we offset the security of Italian lemon growers against the security of California lemon growers?

Answer. It would not be a matter of robbing Peter to pay Paul; it is a matter of the common security of both. If the state of Pennsylvania were to put into effect the tariff principles now obtaining between nations there might be a temporary period of ten years of prosperity because the state possesses a great many basic supplies; but then the state would go down in its fortunes, for it would have prevented the free flow of trade. I, myself, think that the world is not quite ready for free trade, you can't change overnight a world in which, for one hundred years, there have been high protective tariffs. I do believe, however, that our tariff systems must be revised to produce a freer flow of goods around the world.

» » « «

Questions to Mr. Shotwell

Question. Is not the press responsible for focusing attention on possible causes of war?

Answer. Yes, and a useful instrument, to a degree, yet, while everyone wants to be free from delusions we must admit that we have been given a false idea about the irritations leading to war.

Question. How about pressure of population back of the desire for colonies?

Answer. Pressure of population is not to be measured by the people to a square mile but by the standard of living that a nation can maintain. What standard of living can Italian colonists secure in Abyssinia?

» » « «

BUSINESS

Chairman: MISS CHARL O WILLIAMS

MR ALLEN DULLES
DR. FRANK CYRIL JAMES
MR ROY VEAICH
MR THOMAS J WATSON

1. Would the launching of a world-wide free trade movement find any real support and would it help or hinder international understanding which must be a basis for peace work?

2. Would stabilization of currencies with regard to international conditions as well as domestic concerns allay irritations and is it a practical possibility in consideration of Russia's financial policy and Italy's currency situation at the moment?

3. Is it best to "forget the debts" or attempt to negotiate a middle course as between England, France, Italy and the United States—something between complete repudiation, like Germany's and Russia's, and "strict accountability"?

4. How do international industrial organizations or cartels increase international good will, or are the present risks too great, considering past poli-

cies of Russia and Germany, the present one of Italy and probable future one of Japan?

EDUCATION

Chairman: DR AURELIA HENRY REINHARDT

DR MARIA DI BENTIVOGLIO
DR STEPHEN P. DUGGAN
MR JOHN A. KINGSBURY
MISS MARY CRAIG McGEACHY
MISS ANNA McLIN
LADY ZIMMERMAN

1. Is the ultimate source of the continued evidence of the war spirit to be found in the competitive spirit of children of nursery school age—when victory won by force or only by physical strength is rewarded and applauded?

2. Is it possible to conceive of education having no age limits and, if so, should we continue to reaffirm the democratic process in terms of our own government—and point it by citing the expressions of autocracy in the varied forms of dictatorship of the day?

3. Does the relative amount of moral conviction and spiritual determination in student anti-war demonstrations really achieve a purpose?

4. Though history and histories are constantly being written and rewritten, is it possible to interpret events and the printed word so that the efficiency of liberty, cooperation and peace, in producing happiness and prosperity, may become self-evident?

POLITICS

Chairman: MISS MARGUERITE M. WELLS

DR CHARLES G FENWICK
MR GEOFFREY DE FREITAS
LORD LISTOWEL
MR FELIX MORLEY
DR J LEIGHTON STUART

1. Is it practical politics to attempt to get a peace plank that would adequately reflect the peace sentiment in this country into all party platforms and what would be necessary to make it a mandate like the League of Nations vote in England?

2. Will any neutrality legislation, whatsoever, enacted by the United States prove an irritation to other nations and foment instead of quieting the misunderstandings that are the sources of war, and, if so, what shall we do?

3. In what way, if at all, is our proposed increase in naval and air armament different from the rearming and increases in other nations?

4. How can political parties be made to reaffirm in statement and practice our constitutional rights for free press and free assembly, and are they at the moment alert to the invasion of those rights in legislative chambers and public acts of partisanship?

RELIGION

Chairman: MRS FRED S BENNETT

MR STANLEY HIGH
REV JOHN H LATHROP
DR MORRIS S LAZARON
FATHER MCGOWAN
MISS ANNA V RICE

1. Is an "international front" for peace a practical possibility for all the forces of religion throughout the world?

2. Does the independence of church and state need reaffirmation and insistence?

3. Can the ethic of "love thy neighbor" be made practical from individual through community to nation, through the spiritual and moral force of the churches?

4. Is the first step in every effort to perfect the instruments to establish peace the inculcating of a definite social ethic, approached from the individual and personal standpoint, illumined by spiritual emotion, which is the church's essential contribution to civilization?

ERRATUM

The printer made a mistake in the first issue of the Worksheet in heading our Conference as the "Tenth" rather than the "Eleventh" Conference on the Cause and Cure of War. The Conference is up-to-date, even though the Washington printer is not!

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

ELEVENTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR, HALL OF NATIONS,
HOTEL WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 21 TO JANUARY 24, 1936

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

NO. 3

WEDNESDAY EVENING SESSION

Presiding: Louise MacCracken

Round Table: Neutrality, Sanctions and Peace

Participants. ALLEN DULLES
BROOKS EMERY
PHILIP C. JESSUP
JAMES T. SHOTWELL
WILLIAM T. STONE

I. Philip C. Jessup

THERE are three aspects of this subject from the point of view of American history (1) the economic aspect, (2) that which has to do with freedom of the seas or the defense of neutral rights, (3) arbitration. The measures taken by a belligerent nation which endanger the neutrality of other nations are taken not only for winning the war in progress, but also with the objective of securing post-war markets and trade groups.

Another aspect of the neutrality situation is that, historically, neutral nations have always tried to expand their own trade as a result of the war in progress. This has led to interesting complications. For instance, in the Napoleonic wars the French army officers bought British cloth for uniforming the French army. In the World War the Allies contended that a flow of goods was reaching Germany through American trade with Scandinavia and Holland, but it was also discovered that English goods were already going in by that route, the British Board of Trade contended that this was necessary if the trade of England was to be upheld. It must be assumed, therefore, that a war situation involves certain irreconcilable interests and that neutrality laws are for the purpose of securing some sort of compromise in regard to these irreconcilable interests.

Of course, such a struggle involves a fight of business men for their own business interests. This is not so serious, however, save as the government of a neutral country asserts these neutral rights, whereupon it becomes a matter of national honor to be justified, if necessary, by war.

In the history of cooperation between neutral nations as illustrated by the history of the United States there is not much novelty in this idea of cooperation. John Adams, in 1797, in

a message to the Congress asserted that it was natural for nations interested in neutral rights to confer with other nations similarly interested. The League of Nations system suggested a definite kind of cooperation to protect the interest of nations not implicated in a given war, the United States, however, did not participate in that treaty. The Argentine Anti-War Pact, to which the United States is party, asserts the identity of interests of any neutral nation with other neutrals. The Pan-American Neutrality Measure of 1928 carries this same implication. In other words, since 1797 the United States has had tentatively in mind the common action of neutrals for the protection of common interests.

II. James T. Shotwell

IN 1905 war was stopped, largely through the action of the American President who was given the Nobel Prize for this achievement. In 1910, when he accepted this prize, he set forth the principle that the Court procedure which he had furthered at The Hague should be backed up by police power. He was ahead of the public opinion of his time, for this was the utmost stretch of imagination as to what a world community could do.

Then statesmen began to plan again. The League to Enforce Peace was organized, with Mr. Taft as leader in the United States and Lord Bryce and Lord Fillmore as leaders in England. They stood for a juristic scheme; nations were to go to Court over difficulties, decisions were to be enforced by the assembled might of the participating nations. Mr. Wilson never committed himself to this thesis, for the idea of a juristic approach was foreign to his thinking. In the summer of 1916 Wilson studied armaments, in the autumn he began studying intensively the idea of the organization of the world against war. At first he thought of public opinion as enforcement, but in January, 1917, he believed that force must be added to the power of public opinion. Later Senator Lodge, who had been interested in Mr. Taft's scheme, showed how utterly misleading

Mr. Wilson's idea of the use of force would be as a power behind the League of Nations.

That debate has been going on ever since. The defeat of one position at the time of the establishment of the League of Nations illustrated that the American people were international-law-minded. They thought that we were to be committed to a juristic scheme involving irrevocable decisions on our fundamental interests.

Now the League of Nations, as it has developed, is utterly different from this juristic concept. It has a constitution in the background from which it has successively departed just as the United States has departed from its Constitution. From the time of the first assembly of the League of Nations there has been a continuous gradation of the League actions to accord with the specific situations of the member states. We ought to study this developmental aspect of the League rather than confining our studies to the document of the Covenant so hurriedly prepared at Paris.

This aspect of the League came to the fore in the Disarmament Conference. In the French memorandum of 1933 there were two parts, one having to do with principles and the second with arithmetical ratios. The first part was based wholly on the idea of grading the action of the League to the specific situations of various member States. The next spring the British approach to the problem followed suit. Then came Norman Davis' statement that the United States would not stay in the way of those nations which were fulfilling their obligation to the League, but that it would act in due regard to specific circumstances.

Therefore, today these two ideas are at work: (1) A collective system based on a graded approach to the situation; (2) a system of neutrality which now has virtually become a system of isolationist neutrality.

The cooperative collective system is based on the idea that war anywhere is of concern to every nation whether or not they are neutrals, concern in regard to their material interest. This lesson we are steadily learning.

Many claim that sanctions necessarily mean war. This is a careless use of sanctions, for there are all kinds of pressures between nations even in times of peace. The answer is that sanctions will mean war at a time when nations would count on war as the successful strategy for gaining their ends. Italy says that she will not go to war if certain sanctions are laid; Italy will go to war only as war will seem to

save her from some worse disaster. Would she do so if the whole world were organized in placing sanctions upon her? It can be said, therefore, that sanctions are available and perhaps effective but that they do not necessarily involve war. However, so long as there are nations which are or will be aggressive, peace can be achieved only through police power. Is such police power which attempts to stop "Dillinger" nations to be construed as aggression against other nations which are not a part of that police power?

III. William T. Stone

WHAT we are really searching for in this neutrality legislation is an American policy capable of serving the interests of peace and withstanding the pressures of war. If that policy is to be sound it must be based on careful study of the political and economic causes of war and an objective appraisal of the forces making for peace.

We are often told that we must choose between a policy of international cooperation and a policy of isolation. The choice is not nearly so simple at that. International cooperation, for example, may mean either cooperation to remove conditions which lead to war or it may mean cooperation for the suppression of war by military means.

So with neutrality—which has been labelled as extreme isolation—there is a sharp difference between the defense of our traditional rights to trade in war materials and the renunciation of rights which can only be enforced by resort to war. The latter does not prevent international cooperation and is not synonymous with extreme isolation.

These distinctions are important. If they are ignored we are faced with two dangers:

First, there is real danger that those who seek peace through international cooperation will be led step by step to support a holy war waged in the name of peace and justice, for the enforcement of treaties and the preservation of democracy against autocracy. Peace advocates will be led to this end by supporting punitive sanctions against "aggressor" nations which are using force to achieve changes that have not been brought about by peaceful means. If political and economic change cannot be achieved by peaceful means it will be brought about by force, and force in the hands of military dictatorships can only be met by force. The resulting conflict will be war, and its disastrous consequences will not be lessened by giving it the name of collective action.

Second, there is also the danger that those who seek to protect the United States in foreign wars by strict neutrality will not be able to induce the American people to accept the price of peace or to change those national policies which are inconsistent with peace. If they cannot alter our present policies in Asia, our military and naval policies, and our desire to profit from wartime trade, they will find that the retaining walls of neutrality will be swept away.

To avoid these dangers it is essential to define the basic objectives of American policy. These, in my opinion, should be: (1) to reduce the tensions which lead to war, and (2) to reduce the dangers of American involvement. These policies cannot be carried out by legislation alone. A neutrality act can be made a useful instrument to reduce the dangers of American involvement by abandoning "rights" which can only be defended by war. These include the right of American citizens to profit from the trade in arms and war materials and to travel indiscriminately in war areas. But no such legislative enactment will be effective unless it is supplemented by a continuous policy which allows peaceful revision and removal of tensions.

IV. Brooks Emeny

THE problem of neutrality in so far as the United States is concerned, offers an altogether peculiar combination of circumstances. For not only does the geographic situation of this country enable us by virtue of our interoceanic position to trade directly through sea transport with the three great consuming areas of Europe, the Far East and Latin America, but we enjoy, moreover, the control and potential production capacity of from forty-five to fifty per cent of the principal raw materials and industrial products essential to the conduct of modern warfare. In establishing a national policy, therefore, which contemplates the deprivation or the limiting or provisioning of future belligerents with our goods or wealth, we are either making available or denying to other countries a considerable proportion of the world's supply of war essentials.

Now, nations do not resort to war in this modern world purely for the love of fighting but because they are convinced that they exist in a state of necessity from which war is the only escape. Those of us who know our history are also aware of the fact that necessity knows no law. If it be our decision to deprive in the future all belligerents of those goods which are essential to their national security in time of national crisis, we are not thereby going to prevent their resorting to extreme measures. We shall, rather, make it necessary for them to seek the essentials of their national security elsewhere, or in the case of smaller nations, force them to develop at great cost war industries within their own borders.

In so far as this country is concerned, our policy of neutrality has always been dictated by one of two motives: 1. As a means of keeping out of war, 2. As a means of upholding what we have considered our just and natural rights to trade despite the existence of warfare in outlying parts of the world in which we had not a direct interest.

A neutrality policy which contemplates the punishment by America of countries who are so foolish as to resort to arms in reality does not serve as a true policy of neutrality in that it penalizes severely only one set of countries,

those belonging to the dissatisfied or peace-disturbing group. The principal cost, therefore, aside from normal loss of trade in the inauguration of our present contemplated legislation, is to commit ourselves in advance to the policies of the status quo states. If that be our choice, certainly the more effective policy would be to join in a strict alliance with Britain, France and Russia against all aggressors which would virtually make impossible a resort to arms on the part of those countries who in their own national interests are attempting to upset the prevailing peace system.

Given our unique position, therefore, both as to our strategic geographical situation and as the world's greatest provider of the essentials of peace and war the cost of our contemplated neutrality policy may be that we shall set in motion forces which will actually defeat the purposes of our program of action. For certainly, far from making impossible the conduct of war, we shall undoubtedly force the world further along the path of autarchy, thus drawing even more closely exclusive nationalist lines which have served to charge so dangerously the atmosphere of world accord. We shall not prevent war elsewhere through depriving others of instruments of war, but rather drive, particularly the dissatisfied and poorer nations, to more extreme measures for national self-protection, increasing thereby the dangers of world conflict and our own ultimate involvement.

We have already wrecked the economic life of large sections of humanity through the framing of a domestic silver policy calculated solely in our own interests. Are we likewise to destroy the last remaining elements of hope in the working out of a creditable system of peace by striking out alone upon a different line of neutrality policy, the international repercussions of which we have scarcely begun to contemplate?

Round Table Discussion

Leader ALLEN DULLES

Leader This country is facing a concrete problem, there is a possibility of war. How far will old, new or any neutrality legislation keep us out of this war? Mr. Stone seems to be for neutrality legislation, Mr. Emeny is against it. Mr. Jessup, what do you think?

Jessup Following the precedents of history we ought to legislate tentatively, make our approach temporary and not lull people into security by letting them think that we have enacted permanent legislation. I think that our legislation should be along the lines of last August's Act. There are two theories going: (a) If you cut off contacts with the belligerent you will be safe. Does that mean, however, that a little contact with a belligerent means a little war, will you not have to cut every contact? (b) It is said that the accumulation of profits forces us into war, but the mere reducing of profits by neutrality is no guarantee against being involved in a major struggle.

Shotwell I agree most emphatically that

neutrality legislation should be temporary, especially in an election year.

(Mr Emery wants to keep the issue open; Mr Stone agrees that legislation should be temporary Mr Dulles also agrees)

Leader: Is it not possible to reconcile a neutrality policy with collective action by other nations even though we did not cooperate in that collective action?

Shotwell: Yes, I think that we should accept that kind of membership in the League which would mean that we would not stand in the path of collective action Senator Pope's resolution practically indicates that path

Mr Emery If we are to insist as a member of the League on removing the insecurity of so-called peace disturbers, then I will go with you

Shotwell: The word, neutrality, has acquired a new meaning, some believe that neutrality ended with the adoption of the Covenant of the League

Leader: Can we try to get agreement on this point Should we at least modify to some extent our right to defend neutral rights as we conceived them in 1914-1918?

(Mr Jessup and Mr Stone agree)

Mr Emery My quarrel with the proposed neutrality legislation is that the same policy would apply to all conditions. We might, under some circumstances, properly uphold some of these rights Would we proceed in the same way in relation to a war in the Far East as with a war in Europe, for instance?

Question from the floor: What do we mean when we use the word, war?

Mr Jessup War is a legal, a technical term Two nations may kill each other by the thousands and yet it may not be war in a technical sense, we can also have war without a declaration of war Unless one party calls it a war or the outside world so terms it, it is not a war.

Question from the floor: Is it not true that economic sanctions cannot be enforced against the great nations?

Mr Jessup No, this is not true, if there is a united front on the sanctions Even assuming that it is difficult to enforce sanctions, that is no reason for concluding that the system of sanctions is immoral, if it fails in one instance it may succeed in many others.

Leader: Can we get agreement on two more points. (1) Do we not agree that the idea of "trade at your own risk" is one for which we would stand?

(Mr Jessup and Mr Stone agree, if this is taken to mean a risk of both life and property.)

Leader: (2) Would we agree on warning against travel on belligerent vessels?

(Mr Jessup thinks this might be useful, but not worth much. Mr. Stone, Mr. Emery and Mr Shotwell have qualified opinions in regard to the value of this position.

The final agreement in addition to those already reached is that neutrality cannot be solved by the decision of one nation, but must be in part arrived at internationally.)

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

Suggestions for Interviewing Congressmen

BY ELIZABETH EASTMAN

INTERVIEWING anyone is a problem in human relations, by the time you know how to get along with human beings you are usually ready for the old peoples' home!

The best way to begin an interview is to say something in appreciation of what your Congressmen are doing I have not talked with anyone here at this Conference who did not know their Congressmen and how they are voting Remember that a Congressman will probably not vote one hundred per cent in terms of your own attitudes on all subjects!

Give him some information, tell him how a certain number of people in his constituency feel about certain things He knows just how many women you represent, he knows that there are minority groups within your own group Get some information from him In talking about neutrality we are dealing with the hardest subject that has ever been our

concern It is important to assume the rôle of a listener He has been doing some hard thinking about the complex problem of neutrality, find out what he thinks about it, ask what such groups as this can do about neutrality legislation if they are to be effective

The record of the interview is very important It is better to have more than one person interview a Congressman so that there can be a check-up on the impressions gained It is desirable not to allow a Congressman to commit himself in an interview if it appears that his position will be opposite that of yours If he has seemed to evade a question asked early in the interview, ask it again before you leave.

As for the approach to an interview on neutrality take some such lead as this We are all more interested in preventing war than in anything else, but we are not sure how it can be done. What do you think about it?

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Presiding: Miss Alves Long

National Defense

RAYMOND BUELL

CONGRESSMAN GERALD J BOILEAU

CONGRESSMAN COLGATE W DARDEN, JR

I. Raymond Buell

NATIONAL defense is a broad term To the ordinary citizen it usually implies expenditures on behalf of an army, navy and air force because other nations are doing the same thing But to obtain a clear understanding of the subject it is necessary, I think, to ask the question Defense against what? Or defense for what purpose?

Fundamentally these questions reduce themselves to the rôle which force plays in human society As to the rôle of force, four views may be advanced 1 The view of the out-and-out pacifist who believes that all armies and navies should be abolished, and that the relationship of nations should rest purely upon a basis of common interest and goodwill. Although there are very few people who believe that a state can get along without a police force, there are a great many peace lovers who believe that in international relations no force is necessary There are those who argue in regard to this first position that no state has ever gotten along without internal police force; how can a nation, likewise, exist without armies, navies and airports? 2 There is the view which is held by some "new" isolationists, that our army and navy should be reduced to the point necessary

only to defend the continental United States from invasion They believe that there are no rights or interests outside the United States that are worth fighting for. These people do not believe seriously in the possibility of international organization, nor do they care very much whether the aggressors swallow the rest of the world, provided they do not molest the territory of the continental United States 3 There is the view, which is making progress in Europe, that although force is necessary in international relations it should be put under the control of law. Recently I have returned from a four months' stay in Europe where I witnessed the first organized effort since 1918 to curb an aggressor and to establish the principle that all national armies should be subordinated to principles of international law The League of Nations may not succeed in this new effort, but I do know that the League made history last October when it proclaimed Italy to be the aggressor, and when 51 states agreed to apply sanctions against Italy in order to shorten the war This is the first time that the family of nations has attempted to stop the illegal use of force, and to establish the principle that force must be linked up with law

4 There is the view, which is strong in America, that military forces—the army, navy and air forces—should be increased so that this country will not be inferior to other powers Such a force should exist, so the argument runs, not only for the purpose of defending the continental United States from invasion, but to protect the freedom of the seas. The use of this

force, in the case of America, is not subordinated to any system of international courts and law. National interests and national policy alone will determine how these forces are to be used. This system, upon which the world has rested for many years, is called power-politics. This is in opposition to the League idea of force controlled by law; it would imply that we would be moving toward power-politics.

I have briefly sketched four different views as to military force and its rôle in international affairs. I do not know what attitude the two speakers will take toward these views, but I imagine that they will differ as to what the United States should attempt to defend, and as to what are the best means of defense.

II. Gerald J. Boileau

TODAY, despite the Paris Pact, there is a threat of war in the world. Because of the especial responsibility of the United States for this Pact we have a responsibility for furthering its accomplishments. By our action we must evidence our intent to help outlaw war. It is no excuse for us if other nations do not honor this pact.

It is not enough for us to announce a policy of neutrality as proof of the fact that we do not want a war of aggression. Let us retain enough armaments for the defense of our borders, but eliminate all armaments designed for aggression. There is, therefore, no possible justification for expending our strength in enlarging our navy. The crying need of today is for a reorganization of our armed forces consistent with our international philosophy. Let us remember that history shows that no foreign troops were ever landed from ships in aggression on any nation's shores.

There are two possible uses which, to a degree, slightly warrant possession of a large navy: 1. For the protection of foreign trade, 2. On the assumption that the only tactic is to strike first. As for (1) that point indicates the need for neutrality legislation; as for (2), history proves that this thesis in regard to the desirability of striking first is doomed to failure.

No responsible politician would dare suggest today that we should have any policy which would mean that American boys would be sent abroad to fight. We should decrease our armaments in so far as money spent on offensive armaments is concerned. I believe that we should unite our army, navy and air forces as the "Department of National Defense."

III. Colgate W. Darden, Jr.

WHEN I left the Service at the close of the Great War I had definite ideas about the course which my country should take, I have changed my ideas since I have been a member of Congress. In the past months I have been helping to draft a bill for the creation of a naval reserve. The views that I give you today are personal; they represent neither the Navy Department, Congress or the Ad-

ministration. There is no question but that our naval and military expenditures are large, but we live in a troubled and disordered time. We cannot disarm unless we secure comparative disarmament in the world at large.

Since the World War we have had a demonstration of what high-powered machines can do. We know, too, that huge fleets cannot assemble as quickly today as was true in the time of Admiral Nelson. We have experienced, also, the possibilities of a fleet in blockading nations at war. The effect of the British fleet in the North Sea was almost as though it were a rope thrown around the neck of Germany, a noose held by those gray ships lying in the North Sea. We know, too, that if naval armament is to be used, it must be of the best; naval warfare has become essentially machine warfare.

I do not agree with Congressman Boileau that our shores can be defended by a navy of merely defensive strength. In the event of war we would surely face an attempt to blockade our country. The South lost in the Civil War largely because of an effective blockade.

The United States more than lived up to the Washington Naval Treaty. For several years after the treaty went into effect the United States laid down not a single naval vessel, although other nations were arming rapidly in terms of the treaty. If this movement toward armament on the part of other nations goes on, we cannot afford to lag too far behind. This is a matter not of pride, but of very existence. Let us remember that no one knows today what the airplane can really do, even as we did not know at the time of the World War what the real power of the submarine would be.

Preparation for war is expensive, but it is infinitely better to keep a force which can adequately protect this country even as we continue to try to get the nations to reduce their armaments by international agreement.

Round Table Discussion

Leader: **RAYMOND BUELL**

Leader: These statements have invoked history; I should like to have the discussion made more realistic by considering what is to happen in the next war. May I, therefore, propose to Congressman Boileau a question around a contingency which might develop. Suppose that the next war will be in the Orient; Japan is trying to drive China out of power, China will be fighting for a policy which the United States has historically held, under neutrality, as proposed, the United States will stop shipping arms or supplies both to Japan and to China; Japan will say: We have all the arms that we need; China will say: We are fighting for our national existence, we have no manufactures for arms; we want to bring arms in from the United States.

My question is this. Would you favor (a) Imposing an embargo on China, which may mean her defeat? (b) If, during the war between

Japan and China, Japan seized the Philippines where the American flag will wave for a period of ten years, would you favor letting Japan seize the Philippines without opposing it?

Boileau: It might be a harsh position to take, but I would say that we could not sell arms to China in this case. If we take any other position we shall have to choose who is the aggressor or else send arms to any nation which wants them. It is our responsibility to use moral force and to maintain a position of neutrality.

As for the second question (b) History shows that no navy has ever succeeded in landing troops on hostile shores. The Philippines, Hawaii and Alaska should be properly fortified, that ought to be sufficient. If they are loyal to our flag no force can invade them.

Leader: I gather that military experts report that five hundred thousand men would be needed to defend the Philippines, a force three times the size of our present army.

Now a question to Congressman Darden—He said that we must build up our armaments in order to secure agreement of other nations to disarm. Well, suppose this situation. Great Britain is willing to give us parity, Italy repudiates their status, 1-7-5, Italy offers to sign a treaty in regard to disarmament on the condition of parity with England and the United States, such an agreement might call for a 10 per cent or 20 per cent reduction of armaments all around. What would you say of such a situation?

Darden: I would not favor this. The danger would be that such an arrangement would leave out other powers, and would therefore increase the possibility of naval alliances which would make war inevitable.

Leader: Does it follow, therefore, that to uphold your position you would advise building a force equal to an amount greater than the sum of any possible naval alliance—England, France and Japan, for instance?

Darden: No, we could not support an establishment of this size. However, I believe that our relation with these nations is such that this is hardly a possibility. There are hundreds of thousands of citizens in all the countries who are eager for disarmament. It may be, also, that the London Conference, now in session, may result in a further limitation, limitation of armaments offers us our only hope for security for the coming two or three generations.

Leader: There is a third point of view which should have been represented here. War, like crime and racketeering, will never be suppressed by moralism or sentimentalism, it can only be done through international organization. The alternative to international organization is a system of power-politics.

* * *

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEETS

Information on and extra copies of the Delegate's Worksheet may be secured by writing to the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, Headquarters, 1624 Grand Central Terminal Building, New York City.

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

ELEVENTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR, HALL OF NATIONS,
HOTEL WASHINGTON, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 21 TO JANUARY 24, 1936

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

NO. 4

INTERNATIONAL BROADCAST

N.B.C. Network, 4:30-5:00 p.m., January 23

From England, VISCOUNTESS ASTOR
From Washington, CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT
Mrs DANIEL O'DAY
JOSEPHINE SCHAIN

JOSEPHINE Schain opened the international broadcast by summarizing the work of the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War during its eleven years of existence

Mrs O'Day said in part

"Women believe that there is no problem affecting humanity that cannot be settled without recourse to war. Our task, then, is to convert the governments of the world to our belief. This can be done by the sheer force of public opinion, for after all, government is a contrivance of human wisdom to provide for human wants, and the primary object of all governments is, or should be, the welfare of the people."

Mrs CATT: Hello, Lady Astor. I want to say a personal hello before we begin our conversation. Are you there?

LADY ASTOR. Yes, I am here

Mrs CATT: I want to congratulate you upon being the woman who has held a seat in Parliament longer than any other in the world. All friends of the woman movement are proud of you. On behalf of the Cause and Cure of War, I would like to ask: What do you think is the prospect of a general war in Europe? Especially do we want to know what influence the women of England exert upon the peace policy of your country?

LADY ASTOR. Before I thank you and answer your question, Mrs. Catt, may I say how deeply touched everyone in England is at the real sympathy which America has shown her in our great loss?

As for your question: Yes, I remember in 1920 that you and I hoped that a new era was dawning. We expected that all civilized nations would join the League of Nations to prevent world war. We hoped that the women in all countries would get political freedom and fight and work for peace. We hoped and expected that the world had been made safe for democracy and freed from the burden of armaments. But look now at the world we hoped for and the world as it is today. First, three great nations, America, Japan and Germany, are out of this League of Nations which was formed to prevent war.

Then, as to women, in Russia it is true that they may vote, but they can't think aloud, and you and I don't call that freedom. In Germany and Italy the women can neither think aloud nor vote. In France which boasts of having a democracy, women can't yet vote. But in the smaller countries, particularly in our Nordic countries, women are doing well. Democracy, Mrs Catt, is not doing so well as we hoped. Autocracies are going stronger than before the war in some countries. Mr Roosevelt realizes that and pointed out the danger of it.

The prospects of a European war are alarming, for a European war, you know, might mean a world war. The pity is that most European women can do so little to prevent war.

Fortunately the influence of the women in England is enormous and they stand solidly for the League of Nations. But since this Italian war they see the danger and limitation of a partial League of Nations, and that, Mrs Catt, is why I am speaking to the women of America, because I feel that we women must do something about it.

Mrs CATT. How do the English political parties stand?

LADY ASTOR. All parties in England stand for peace and the League. An interesting thing has happened since this Italian affair. The most rabid pacifists are beginning to realize that the price of peace is the same as the price of liberty, and that the fight for liberty was a fight and not a wish. Liberty and freedom did not come because men wished it, men and women had to lay down their lives and their prejudices to get it. Don't let us lose heart.

Surely the first step for peace is to lay down our national prejudices. Sometimes it seems almost easier to lay down your life than your prejudices.

Don't you think, Mrs. Catt, that the women of our two great democracies, the strongest and greatest and most enlightened in the world, could debunk the idea that peace can be secured for our own countries while war is in the world? Can't we prove that peace is no longer a national question? Can't we begin by laying down our prejudices and working collectively for the peace of the world and the ultimate freedom of all mankind? Surely, Mrs. Catt, women who know the horrors of war can do

no other. Can't we make our men realize that there is such a thing as moral righteousness, and that there can be no such thing as neutrality between right and wrong; that to stand aside from collective action to keep the peace of the world is not only morally wrong but impossible to practise in the world of today?

Mrs CATT. Well, I think you are entirely right. The women, in the main, have been working for the very idea you present. Personally I am as sure that permanent peace will come ere long to the world as I am sure that the sun will rise tomorrow. Is that not true?

LADY ASTOR. Yes, but it seems a little long off unless we get together, particularly the women of the British Empire and of the United States of America who ought to give a lead.

Mrs CATT: You are quite right, and they will get together. The greatest enemy of all new ideas, as you know, is ignorance, and there is plenty of it in the United States, as elsewhere. The next greatest enemy is loyalty to all customs long established, and war is the oldest institution in the world.

The third greatest enemy is the war institution itself with its traditions of honor and glory, plus the vested interests which make profit from war. The real problem of peace versus war is that no nation is willing to take the risk of disarming itself while other nations are preparing for war. The way to secure peace, say the militarists, is to be so much stronger than your enemy that he dare not attack you. The way to secure peace, say the pacifists, is to make an international agreement to disarm down to the level defined by the League of Nations as necessary for home defense. Which theory is right is the question upon which the entire controversy between peace makers and war makers depends. The world has uniformly adopted the first policy and has supported it for several thousand years. That theory has never stopped war, but has steadily built up the war machine to a greater and ever more deadly power.

In Great Britain, in the United States, in every country, public opinion must give governments the courage to act. You are right that the women of the world can unite and exercise a mighty influence over this question. We stand with you and by you. We take hands together, and will work on until we see the end of the war business. The peace makers of the United States place their trust in the peace makers of Great Britain, and we beg you to trust us

THURSDAY EVENING SESSION

Presiding: Esther G. Ogden

A Town Meeting: Peace and Party Platforms

CLARK EICHELBERGER
SENATOR JAMES P. POPE
CONGRESSMAN THOMAS R. AMLIE
CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON FISH, JR

WITHIN a few months the platforms of the various political parties will be written. Let us think of this meeting tonight as the convention of the party to which you belong. These three men representing three different parties, will speak to you of what they believe to be worthy of consideration as party planks on foreign policy. After these statements, will you suggest what you would like to see as party planks?

I have just been reading the party platforms of the years 1844-1900, noting how little they say about foreign relations. We were too busy conquering a new empire; there is much more in these platforms about the need of a railroad to the Pacific Coast than about foreign relations. Frank Simonds once said, "We were actually more isolated from Europe in 1914 than in 1797." We gave to the world the pattern of the future international society and then refused to have anything to do with it. We have seemed to desire to be great without responsibility, to claim leadership without being willing to pay the price.

Here are the points on which I hope that the speakers will comment: world cooperation; the status of the Kellogg Pact, the World Court, neutrality; economic cooperation; our silver policy; currency stabilization, military policies, the Good Neighbor policy, the need to preserve the forces of democracy; the leadership of our country in international relations.

The first speaker is a member of the Democratic Party; the second a member of the Farmer-Labor Party, the third a member of the Republican Party.

I. Senator James P. Pope

I AM not certain that any of the questions indicated by Mr. Eichelberger will be noted in our party platform; usually platforms do not include such heated questions as these, and in any case they are treated in a rather moderate fashion. On the Hill we are now discussing not the causes of war, nor even the cure of war, but rather, how to stay out of war. It has always seemed to me more important to deal with any difficulty by trying to prevent it through isolating the causes than to try to cure it after it gets started. A quarantine against either disease or war is all right in its way, but it does nothing toward removing the causes. I am for neutrality legislation but there is a more fundamental thing involved in preventing war before it starts.

Here is a brief summary of points in party

platforms in our history since 1900. In 1900 both the Democratic and the Republican platform said something about maintaining friendly relations with all nations and evading entangling alliances. Nothing more is said about this until 1916 when the Democratic Party endorsed the League of Nations. This seemed to imply that the duty of the American people was not only to make itself safe at home, but to assist the world in making international relationships move toward peace. In that same year the Republican platform indicated the desire for peace and, to that end, the hope for peaceful settlement of international disputes and entrance into the World Court. I assume that these two points will be in both platforms this year.

In 1920 the Republican platform indicated belief in the need for international agreement for preserving the peace of the world, that year the Republicans won. In 1928 the Democratic platform favored the outlawry of war, freedom from entangling alliances (and, interestingly) full, free and open cooperation with other nations for the promotion of peace throughout the world. The Republican platform in 1928 approved the Coolidge foreign policies, which included the World Court.

In 1932 both the Republicans and the Democrats were sure of one thing: The need for American adherence to the World Court, the Republicans gave more space to this in their platform than did the Democrats. I was in the Senate when the vote on the World Court was taken, forty-four Democrats voted for it and twenty against it; nine Republicans voted for it and sixteen against it. On the assumption that party platforms mean anything at all, here was one clear mandate, the support of both parties in relation to the World Court, and yet, enough members of both parties voted against it to defeat it. Another interesting anomaly is noted in regard to the need for a two-thirds vote of the Senate on treaties. It is odd that the one-third who vote against a given treaty have no power to construct a positive foreign policy, no other country has such a situation.

What will the Democrats do in their forthcoming platform? The answer is that I have no idea as to the answer. The platform will probably favor peace and abhor war; we will congratulate ourselves on being on terms of friendship with all the world, but I do not expect a program for constructive peace. Perhaps something will be said about disarmament, this will be safe to say, for we never do anything about it. There will undoubtedly be a statement: "We believe in adequate preparedness."

I believe, however, that when we are no longer quite so afraid of being involved in the

present war situation, we may consider our relations to the world community. We may then realize that law and order in this world community must be established as a basis, and that therefore a group of nations will have to work it out. We may then begin to think about what will bring real and permanent peace to the world.

II. Congressman Thomas R. Amlie

THERE seems to be no question but that we are now living in a capitalistic system, its characteristics are the need for new frontiers and the demand for constantly widening horizons for population and for excess capital. As long as there was the possibility of new frontiers and of expansion for excess capital in the building of the west, we were living in a practically fool-proof system. Now our new frontiers have disappeared; the World War was a logical consequence of a slowing-up process which began in 1912.

The War furnished an outlet for goods and services, forty-five billion dollars' worth. This served to stimulate our industrial machine, with the result that economic benefits accrued to the American people as a whole. In the period of the War those with an income of \$50,000 increased from 7,500 in number to 18,800. Tremendous forces led us into the War, in 1914 we had, for instance, a total trade with the Central Powers of \$170,000,000; this was reduced by the war blockade to less than a million dollars. It was this and similar situations that led Walter Hines Page, our ambassador in London, to declare to Wilson that the stress of the war situation on our trade indicated the need for our participation in the war. I believe that unless we understand that the forces driving us to war are economic, we understand nothing.

We came to the end of our fools' paradise in 1929, aware then that the war debts would probably never be paid and that there was no use in increasing our investments in the production of goods. As our economic activities slow up, we find ourselves being driven rapidly to war.

Is the problem, perhaps, to find new frontiers for trade at home? Can we reorganize our economic system to give us these new frontiers? It is estimated that we could increase our agricultural output by 40 per cent. But apparently there is no near solution in turning this economic system over to the American people, this system which, I think, inevitably leads to war.

Yet I believe that certain things could be done here and now. We could enact mandatory neutrality legislation; the Neutrality Act of last August should be extended both in time and in scope. Of course, if a world war results, powerful forces would try to overthrow such legislation. I believe that discriminatory powers in regard to neutrality should not be given to the President. This program of mandatory neutrality legislation is the one on which we should now embark.

III. Congressman Hamilton Fish, Jr.

SENATOR Pope urges us to find and prevent the causes of war, but he does not tell us how to bring about that much-desired result [I presume that he implies that we should use the machinery of the League of Nations, but even the Democrats are afraid to mention the League publicly! I admit that there will be no League of Nations plank in the Republican platform. As for the last speaker, he thinks that the capitalist system is the cause of war and therefore should be destroyed. I would remind him that wars have existed long before the rise of American industrial capitalism. Let me remind you, too, that although there were increased profits by virtue of the World War, there was also an 80 per cent excess profit tax which the government took for the conduct of the war. And no one need fear the accumulation of wealth in the United States today!]

I believe that there will be wars for thousands and thousands of years, until you and I become angels, until human nature changes.

It is hard to say what will be in the Republican platform on foreign relations. We shall probably stand just about where the Democrats stand—on a non-committal platform. We shall probably be in favor of the strictest form of neutrality, against the shipment of arms and munitions of war, we shall be for peaceful relations with the world. But this will mean nothing at all. The only party that has been consistent in its platform is the Communist Party, the Republicans and Democrats make a platform one day and forget it on the next.

I stand for the extension of the Neutrality Act of last August providing for embargoes on arms for both belligerents and for embargoes on loans to both belligerents; I would except, however, the South American nations when they are attacked by nations other than North American groups. I am absolutely opposed to giving the President discretionary powers which would mean the determining of the aggressor. I do not agree that we ought to join the League of Nations.

As for the Republican Party, we refuse to become entangled in ancient foreign blood-feuds and boundary disputes. The Republican Party is willing to vote millions for defense but not one dollar to send American soldiers to foreign countries to fight other people's battles.

Round Table Discussion

Leader: CLARK EICHELBERGER

Leader: It would not be difficult to see how these three speakers would write their party platforms. Senator Pope would write in a program of wide political cooperation with the rest of the world. Congressman Amhe's platform would read much like the political platform which Norman Thomas wrote a few years ago. Congressman Fish's platform would contain a considerable amount of moral superiority which

I myself am at present unable to feel in regard to my country. What would you yourselves like to write into these political platforms?

There followed a question in regard to the opinion of each speaker about writing in a plank which would build our national foreign policy on the enabling of the Pact of Paris. Senator Pope and Congressman Fish were for it, Congressman Amhe made no comment. Senator Pope suggested a conference of the signers of the Paris Pact, to be called by our own Secretary of State, to consider some means to make it effective. Congressman Fish, although speaking of the Kellogg Pact as "the greatest bloodless revolution in the world," thought it was not of much significance.

Question from the floor: How about planks on the Japanese Exclusion Act, the stabilization of currency and the lowering of tariffs?

Congressman Amhe thinks that no political party would come out for the reduction of tariffs. He believes in the policy of the open market, and would make it possible for free interplay of economic forces both in our own country and in the world. Tariffs, he thinks, could never be reduced in a period of economic contraction. Congressman Fish stands on the belief of the Republican Party in protecting American standards of wages and living. Senator Pope reminds us that the Democratic Party has already dared to attempt to reduce tariffs by agreement with nations in question. He warns that tariffs must be reduced as fast as possible if we are not to have war.

As for the Japanese Exclusion Act, Congressman Amhe and Congressman Fish do not reply. Senator Pope gives as his personal opinion his belief that the Exclusion Act is responsible for a great deal of the bitterness of Japan toward the United States.

Question from the floor: Can we indicate anything that can be done to the present Neutrality Act which will make it possible for the President to lift an embargo on the attacked nation?

Congressman Fish thinks that this would be another way of determining the aggressor and therefore a hostile act. Senator Pope reminds that the President already has large discretionary powers in that at any time he can recommend war to Congress.

Question from the floor: Can not Congressman Amhe give us a plank for his party on foreign relations?

Congressman Amhe: I can add nothing save my personal position. I would go no further than to provide broad, mandatory neutrality legislation, and stress the fact that there can be no solution with the present economic situation driving us to war.

Leader: May I remind you that the League of Nations is moving toward a consideration of the economic causes of war? It may be that the economic conservatism of the United States will be the greatest deterrent to world organization.

Mrs. Catt Is Honored

ON Wednesday afternoon President Roosevelt received in his office Mrs. Catt and a group which included the heads of the eleven cooperating Women's organizations, and the officers of the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War. The President presented to Mrs. Catt the following letter:

WHITE HOUSE

January 22, 1936

"My dear Mrs. Catt:

Our old friendship, dating back to the days when I was a very young State Senator in 1911, would be sufficient reason for me to write you on your completion of half a century of public service. But there is a greater reason—because the whole country applauds you and your very great contributions to our well-being.

The many years of devoted work which you gave to the cause of woman's suffrage have long since been justly rewarded, not only by the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution in our own country, but also by marked improvement in the status of women throughout the world.

Those of us who are directly concerned with the maintenance and encouragement of peace between nations are also grateful to you for the splendid leadership you give to the cause of peace and the furtherance of the prevention of war.

May you continue for many years to come as the strong and active captain in these noble objectives of a better civilization.

With my warm regards,

Always sincerely,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT"

Mrs. Catt replied, in part, as follows:

"I don't know why I should be thanked, because I have always done just what I wanted to do. But I think I ought to write you a grand letter and thank you for all you have done for women. I have rejoiced some times to find that you had appointed a woman to quite an important place. That is, to my mind, the greatest possible blessing to the woman's movement. We are especially proud, of course, that there is a woman in the Cabinet; proud, too, of Mrs. Owen, in Denmark, who is doing wonderful work; proud of many other women whom you have appointed. I don't see how any President in the future can ever recede from what you have done. You have it started as it never was before, and so I thank you most cordially for that.

"It is true that I have held a suffrage office longer than anybody else in the world ever did. The old suffrage association is still alive and I am still its president. We didn't know in the beginning but that there might be some difficulty, so we are still going. There are many of us. We were a great army at the last, upwards of two millions of women and they came, they went, they died.

"Now what am I going to do with this letter? I am going to frame it and hang it up on my wall, and I am going to make a copy of it and send it to all members of my national board, and I am going to tell them what I said to you. It was not an honor that I had earned alone, but it came to us all together, because it belongs to them as well as it does to me."

Mrs. William Dick Spurborg asked the President if it would be possible to have a govern-

ment medal commemorating Mrs. Catt's half century of public service. President Roosevelt accepted this suggestion, but suggested that the matter might wait for the anticipated passage of a new law now before the Congress under which the striking off of such medals would be simplified. It may be that Mrs. Catt's medal will be the first to be issued under the new law.

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

Presiding: Charl O. Williams

Peace Programs of Cooperating Organizations

EACH one of the eleven cooperating organizations reported interesting details about their peace programs. This report showed the variety of ways of organization which characterize these eleven groups, this, in turn, illustrated the different ways in which the groups can and do secure action on pending legislation. Each group reported cooperation with a variety of organizations at work in this field. It was also to be noted that the organizations are concerned to meet the desires of their members for helpful material in this field, this material is either produced by the organization itself or recommended as from some group which publishes pamphlets along this line.

* * * *

Behind the Scenes in Washington

IN dramatic form a group showed the actual working of the Women's Joint Congressional Committee, which has been functioning successfully since 1920.

The Women's Joint Congressional Committee (informally known as the W J C C) is a clearing-house for the congressional legislative work of national organizations engaged in promoting federal measures of special interest to women. It does not itself endorse, promote or propose any such measures. It merely provides the machinery by which the member organizations interested in a given measure can pool their efforts without in any way involving other member organizations which are not actively concerned in it.

The activities of the Women's Joint Congressional Committee consists of two general types: those concerned with routine administration and general information service to member organizations, and those for the pooling of legislative effort, accomplished through so-called legislative committees.

The skit illustrated these two general types of work by showing first the general procedure at one of the regular meetings held once a month while Congress is in session, and then

what might happen at a meeting of a legislative committee.

SCENE 1 A MEETING OF THE WOMEN'S JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE

After a report of the treasurer, who reported \$65 in the treasury, the standing committees gave their report. The Committee on Admissions gave information about membership in the W J C C, pointing out that organizations are eligible which have endorsed at least one federal legislative measure, whose objectives are not in opposition to the objectives of other member organizations; who have filed a copy of their official program. The Follow Up Committee reported on the status of legislation on which action had been taken by the W J C C, the World Court, for instance, will not be taken up this session, said the committee. The Entertainment Committee announced the annual dinner of the W J C C given to women members of Congress and other prominent women in Washington. The Legislative Committee reported progress in a study of pending legislative proposals; their plan for a poll of members of Congress. The Committee on Support of Trade Agreements discussed the number of member organizations who might be interested in forming a committee on this subject. A special committee reported progress in making a study of the legislative procedures of the member organizations.

SCENE 2 A MEETING OF A LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE W J C C. ON NEUTRALITY

Each organization reported what it was doing to promote neutrality legislation. It was agreed that the W J C C was not getting enough information from local groups of member organizations in regard to what they were doing on this subject. The chairman suggested a poll of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to learn their position. The committee then allotted one member of this committee to each person present. Someone suggested that it might be well to find out what was now happening in the Senate in regard to neutrality legislation; a member goes out to telephone Senator Pittman's secretary. As a result of this telephone conversation the women adjourn swiftly to take a taxi to the Capitol.

Proposed Program for 1936

Recommended to the Eleven Participating Organizations by the Eleventh Conference on the Cause and Cure of War

I. GENERAL STATEMENT OF AIMS

THE eleven member organizations of the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War join in sponsoring the annual conference as a source of both inspiration and concrete suggestions for their efforts to establish world peace. Each organization carries on a broad program of which the work for international peace is one division. The setting-up of peace departments has come about because these organizations, motivated by high ideals for their own nation and the human race, realize that the prevention of war is a necessary condition for the attainment of their primary objectives in whatever field they lie—religion, education, civic life, social problems, or economic relations.

Successive conferences have recognized that the problem of war is highly complex, but we believe that it is not insoluble. The complexity of the problem requires that many groups should work toward its solution, although not necessarily in the same way nor with the same emphasis. The National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War can contribute most effectively to the peace movement by finding the common interests in the international programs of the participating organizations, enabling them to correlate their activities where intensive efforts of large numbers of citizens are most needed.

In order to carry on our activities it is necessary to protect the democratic practices of free speech, free press and free assembly. If these be lost, the opportunity to work on a constructive program for peace would be hampered if not completely denied.

In planning this program we are not unmindful of the need of high spiritual concepts which are necessary for its achievement, and which must constitute the personal dynamic of living for each participating individual.

II. RECOMMENDED 1936 PROGRAM FOR SUPPORT AND STUDY

The Eleventh Conference on the Cause and Cure of War recommends to its participating organizations that they concentrate their efforts on the following during the year 1936.

A. Issues now before the country for action:

- 1 Revision of the neutrality policy of the United States
a support of legislation to implement the announced policy of the United States "to avoid being drawn into war and not to contribute to the prolongation of war."
b promotion of public understanding of the significance of the new American attitude toward neutrality, with special emphasis on the relation of the neutrality policies of the United States to the collective efforts of other nations to maintain international peace by cooperative methods.
- 2 The continued support of national control of the manufacture of and trade in arms, ammunition, and the implements of war.

- 3 Support of the maintenance of the reciprocal trade agreement program of the United States as a means of relaxing international economic tensions and contributing to the restoration of international trade
- 4 Opposition to the continuously expanding budgets for the army, navy and air forces as being inconsistent with our commitments under the Pact of Paris
- 5 Abolition of compulsory military training in schools and colleges.

B. Fundamental issues on which the United States must be preparing itself to act:

The conference reaffirms its recommendations of support of the following, and urges the participating organizations which have not yet gone on record in their favor to do so during the coming year

1. Membership of the United States in the League of Nations on terms consistent with its commitments under the Pact of Paris
2. Adherence of the United States to the World Court.
3. Reduction of armaments by international agreement

C. Promotion of studies for the purpose of determining measures to be recommended for support at the 1937 conference

- 1 Relation between war and the economic life
The Conference recognizes that economic conditions constitute an important element in the conflicts which lead to war and that war, in turn, profoundly affects the structure and functioning of our economic life. How to break the vicious circle is one of the most vital problems before the world today. Many solutions have been proposed, but none that goes to the root of the matter has actually been tried. Slogans and empty formulas still characterize much of the discussion of the question.

The Conference is not prepared at this time to endorse concrete proposals beyond the recommendation made in IL A3, but it recommends that the National Committee promote a study of the relation between war and economic life in order that the question may be more clearly understood by our constituencies and in order that a constructive program of action may be recommended at the 1937 conference

- 2 National Defense.
Tremendously inflated military budgets and the failure of post-war disarmament efforts make imperative new approaches to the problem of armaments. We believe that the primary step is a clarification of what is meant by *adequate national defense*. Does it mean defense of our citizens abroad as well as at home? the protection of distant territories, including the Philippine Commonwealth? the policing of our lines of foreign trade? In addition to a clarification of the reasons why we maintain armed forces, there is needed a consideration of the efficiency of our establishments in the light of modern conditions and inventions

The conference therefore recommends that the National Committee promote a thorough study of the various aspects of the problem of national defense, in order that a constructive program of action may be recommended at the 1937 conference

III. PROPOSED PROJECTS

In order to facilitate the attainment of the objectives of the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, the Eleventh Conference urges that the participating organizations encourage their local and state units to undertake the following projects, and in each case to check at the end of the year the advance which has been made.

1. Make an analysis of the public opinion of the community in regard to the possibilities of the elimination of war, with a view to estimating advance or retrogression or any change in such opinion during the year
2. Make a study of the editorial policy of the

newspapers and periodicals of the community; take definite steps to encourage and support those papers which are attempting to present an unbiased interpretation of events and issues related to peace and war.

3. Make a study of the opinions regarding peace and war which seem to be prevalent among business groups and among labor groups, seek the cooperation of these groups in community programs.
4. Estimate how far the education in your own organization has gone in reaching individual local members. It is now taken for granted that the leaders in the organizations have learned how to study international questions and are familiar with current situations, but it is an open question as to how far this education has penetrated to every member of each organization.
5. Continually advance the understanding of international affairs and problems in each community, through the establishment of Marathon

Round Tables, support of forums, use of press projects, radio broadcasts, etc.

6. Make a definite effort to further the possibilities of cooperation among organizations working for peace by spreading information regarding the National Peace Conference of the United States and the Peace and Disarmament Committee of the Women's International Organizations.
7. Analyze the records of all Congressmen from your state as to their past actions which indicate their position on questions of peace and war
8. Make definite plans to give encouragement to those Congressmen whose records are commendable and to secure more favorable action on the part of others, keep an accurate record of their position on peace questions, for the check-up at the end of the year
9. Give more attention to learning how to meet opposition and how to deal constructively with the attacks on those who are working for peace

FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Presiding: Mrs. Kendall Emerson

Educating the Mass Mind

I. Harold Lasswell

WHAT are the ways and means of action which will bring about mass support on programs of peace? What are the reasons for the relative lack of success of civic and non-civic organizations on behalf of public measures? These organizations have certain advantages over the program of what you might call profit-making organizations; they have a great moral reserve upon which they may draw; they have both public respect and a certain kind of self-respect. But moral sincerity is not enough, for only too frequently self-sacrificing people have come to grief because they take ways and means for achieving their objectives which do not bring success.

1. The objectives of these sincere groups often fail to attain maximum effect because their advocates are not good demagogues in crises, they think demagoguery not becoming. And yet a year ago in the World Court campaign it was possible for certain forces to arouse the public to what were called grave dangers by succeeding in mobilizing honest fears to such a degree that the scene in Washington was affected thereby. We try to stimulate people to study, to reflect. Yet in a time of crisis the problem is to organize the emotions of people in terms of overt acts; only those who are willing so to use emotions in stimulating to action will be successful. If we are to be prepared to meet crises we must prepare for these crises by having leaders in whom people have confidence so that at the moment of crisis the emotional approach of these leaders will be respected and met. Not enough leaders have in the past been willing to use what I call demagogic action in crises.

2. There is another lesson from the crises of a year ago. The problem of civic and peace or-

ganizations is to win over the mass support of the rank and file. Most of such organizations talk to themselves rather than seeking contact with those whom they do not ordinarily touch. The rank and file of citizens are organized in occupational or functional groups. There are, for instance, the service clubs. These have been neglected by those who are interested in peace, for procedures have not been invented for making contact with their program. Yet the people who make up these service clubs, business and professional people of smaller incomes, are those who are excited by mass movements in crises. It is housewives in middle-sized or small communities, working groups and business men who are stimulated to political effectiveness by emotional storms in crises; to a measure they hold the balance of power in American life.

We must seize every occasion in which we can show the relationship between the interests of this group and proposed social action. These are some of these points of relationship; the list of those in their community killed or damaged in war, their profound personal reasons for resenting a kind of social system which demands its blood sacrifice; the question as to how much they will pay in taxes for old and future wars.

The problem of peace is sometimes too narrowly conceived, it has to do not only with reducing war but with social conflicts within nations which are sometimes an outlet in place of war. When prosperity is halted internal difficulties develop: unemployment, a lower standard of living, civic violence. War is a distraction from internal difficulties. We must learn the technique of centering attention upon a contemporary problem of interest to people and then passing on to point out the next problem after our old insistence has become insignificant. We live in a world unsteady and insecure; we must find ways in which a peace program can seem to the mass of people relevant and significant.

II. Louise Wilson

MANY women are asking how we can make the newspapers write the story of our activities in ways other than that in which they are ordinarily written. We must remember that news is something specific. You yourself are much more interested in what your neighbor thinks about neutrality legislation than in what she thinks of the total peace program. Why not go to your local editor and tell him that you are going to the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, he might order an article from you on your return and give you some help in learning how to write it. The radio is important as a medium for you have access to local stations; in a way it is easier than writing for the newspaper for there are fewer rigid rules as to what is a good radio speech than is true for a newspaper article. May I commend the Delegates Worksheets as a source for news write-ups and radio speeches

Cooperating Internationally

I. Mary A. Dingman

THE Conference on the Cause and Cure of War is, in a way, the prototype of the Peace and Disarmament Committee of the Women's International Organizations. How many of you know what your own international body is doing in Geneva, are you weaving this story into your local program? I believe that we are forging through this organization in Geneva an instrument for the building of a world community. When it was organized in September 1931, it was brought into being to forward disarmament. Today it has much more than that as its objective, it is the voice of women of the world in Geneva, the symbol of the solidarity of the world of women for peace.

Here are some of its activities, deputation letters to members of the League Assembly; luncheons to prominent members of the League Assembly; a recent meeting in which Mr. Benes listened to what women thought to be the problems of the Assembly; a telegram to Mussolini recording the feeling of the women of the world about the present conflict; the offices, the center for conferences; a bureau of information; a training center for understanding the problems of peace; a publishing center for informational material; an assembly of knowledge of what women of other countries are doing; cooperation with an unofficial conference in constant session in Geneva, as representatives of all the organizations there talk about public opinion in relation to international issues.

We have a very humble budget; I have been suggesting as I have traveled that each city might take fifty dollars as a pledge to this budget, asking about ten groups in the city to be responsible for five dollars of this sum.

We need you in this work; tell your community about its significance.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

616 delegates and alternates

14 visitors

II. Mme Clara Guthrie d'Arcis

MY EXPERIENCE, which has been both in the business world and in relation to the peace movement, has convinced me that until the business and the industrial forces are mobilized around the peace movement we shall not succeed in that program. By business I mean all the forces of the commercial world, transportation, export, import, etc. Can they be made to see that through enlightened self-interest they might well cooperate with the women's peace movement? I am in this country now to discuss this proposition before a group of business men in New York. Can they see that the problem of unemployment cannot be met by the manufacture of arms; that the interests of labor are in stable conditions, that business men could hasten a gradual reduction of tariffs which are now strangling the world, these are business problems. Women are vitally concerned in this economic disarmament for they are the purchasers of the world.

The question is as to whether the Peace and Disarmament Committee of the Women's International Organization in Geneva can link these two vital interests. The munitions inquiry has turned the spotlight on business, and the public is tempted to believe that business men will never oppose war because of its profits. Will enlightened business men sustain this belief of public opinion as it exists today, or will they see some common interest of their own with that which we hold as women of the world concerned with world peace?

These are our objectives:

- 1 To find out and let women know throughout the world whom they can count upon for cooperation in the great cause of peace, to which they are more and more consecrating themselves.
- 2 To persuade those leaders of industry who have not yet done so to analyze their own business problems in relation to peace as a basic necessity to prosperity. We further hope that through enlightened self-interest they may be induced to take a stand by making a declaration to the effect that war is bad business, and that the establishment of peace is an integral part of their international policy.
- 3 To convince leading men of international affairs of the incalculable potential influence for peace embodied in this Peace and Disarmament Committee of the Women's International Organizations with its ramifications throughout the civilized world, and of the practical value of cooperation with the women of the world for peace.

3 To get them to enlist themselves by putting peace in their budgets, and thus to obtain financial as well as moral support, so that this great force of women's collective

good will represented by this committee may be implemented and become fully effective.

4 To encourage public opinion (now dangerously pessimistic), and thus to contribute to the reestablishment of confidence by the Women's International Economic Peace Roll. To this end we shall ask them to communicate their statement of position to their employees down to the last man in the last factory.

III. Mary Craig McGeachy

THE two speakers who have spoken this afternoon have told you of their hopes and desires for the future of world organization. A representative of the secretariat of the League of Nations cannot express hopes, we merely state facts.

Through the activities of the League a real habit of international cooperation is being developed in practical terms and in many spheres of life. Although the League of Nations was set up to promote international cooperation it was soon realized that peace is not created by signing a treaty, but rather that it was built up by a series of cooperative undertakings in the interests of ordinary life. These cooperative enterprises have grown up as the response to a series of emergencies, as it was recognized that the peace of the world could not come save as we cleared up certain threats to peace in internal difficulties in the lives of nations. Thus it is that the League of Nations has been dealing through these years with the fields of education, public health, social justice, etc.

In the first four or five years certain crises emerged as a result of the war. For instance, an epidemic of typhus in Poland resulted in the organization of the section on health which now correlates the research of groups in various countries and so serves to develop health security throughout the world. The social section of the League resulted from the pressure of women's international organizations which felt that social conditions in the various countries should be dealt with on an international plane, an early instance of this was the inquiry into the traffic in women about which Dame Rachel Crowley has undoubtedly told you.

As the emergency period passed, the League was increasingly able to deal with the preventive aspects of social problems. Today we are faced with a new economy with its new problems; we must adjust our prejudices and tastes to a new world, new sociological problems. It is to this task that the social section of the League is committed. It is pooling experience of all the nations in regard to ways in which new social problems are being met. The result of its work is not an international treaty, but suggestions of work made from one country to another.

The fields that I have mentioned are merely illustrative of this phase of the work of the League. Through these activities we are developing the habit of thinking together, the necessary prelude to the organization of the world community.

IV. Lady Zimmern

MRS. CATT has reminded us of the topic of our program, there are many roads to peace. May I substitute the word, life, for peace? Peace is not the goal, but life; and peace is the way to life. In our hurry to live we too often forget life.

May I suggest some points for your consideration? Here are some of the groups with whom we must deal in our cause; perhaps we, ourselves, belong to one or the other of them. 1. There are those who are not on any path at all; all that we ask of them is that they keep quiet when there is something to be done. 2. There are those who walk on what they think to be the path of peace, but they are in too much of a hurry, and sometimes they

dash off on a tangent. 3. There are those who distrust the scholars, those informed people who try to prevent those who are in haste from committing suicide. 4. There are those who are definitely obstructing the path to peace, they want not peace but war, for war has for them certain advantages.

Democracy does not demand demagogues but leaders, the choice of our leaders will save us from dictators. Let us call the scholars down from their ivory towers to help us; too many people are informed about events without knowing their significance.

Let us remember that without spiritual motivation we cannot achieve. Human nature is made up of mind, body and spirit; these are not separate elements but one whole. Our program and our education must be built on this.

equally distributed among our citizens are now recognized as just. One evidence of the futility of the Civil War is found in the remark of one present-day statesman "If I am elected President I shall do nothing to further anti-lynching legislation." To this man the principle of states rights is more important than the lives of people and the moral depravity that will result in our citizenry if they succumb to mob rule.

With passionate patience we watch for every point of advance. In two instances mine eyes have seen the glory of the Lord. Jane Addams and her group at The Hague in 1915 and Cordell Hull with the representatives of twenty other American States at the Montevideo Conference in 1933. In 1915 our nation was about to enter the World War, in 1933 we met in Montevideo at a time when two countries of South America were sacrificing their youth in a futile war. Yet in both situations one saw the glorious possibility of courageous leadership.

There is significance in that we are now daring to name our national policies in terms of Scripture, the Good Neighbor, the Golden Rule. We are searching amid baffling difficulties for the path to peace, that path must be found and the way charted. Even before 1915 I hoped for an organized world state. I still hope for it, a commonwealth in which all peoples shall share in the good life on a materialistic as well as a spiritual level.

FRIDAY EVENING SESSION

Presiding: Josephine Schein

Facing the Future

I. Dr. Sophonisba Breckinridge

MARY Heaton Vorse, returning from the war front in 1915 said, "I have seen no glories of war but I did see the boys go off singing." In that comment one sees both the shame and the glory of war. Those boys were betrayed by some of the abstractions which we spoke at that time, the self-determination of small nations, making the world safe for democracy, the use of force to obtain worthy ends.

Today our highest interests and our deepest convictions are in danger of betrayal by the present situation: the mad search for power at the cost of weaker states; the barbaric desire for national glory; the selfish search for profits, including the exploitation of our workers at home; our pathetic inability to deal with the complexities of modern life, the inequalities of our distribution of goods as compared with our capacity for production. Those of us who seek peace must, therefore, recognize the true grievances of this situation, and acknowledge the futility and the wickedness of the use of force both in the development of international life and in our own internal economy.

Our present world has alarming features which threaten all the interests of those of goodwill. I am convinced, however, that a frontal attack on these evils, the use of force in dealing with them, must give way to a more fruitful approach. Tonight I testify to the faith that is in me, my conviction that no possible

gains of war can balance the evil results of it in hatred, competitive conflict, domestic tragedy and the loss of those values of character which we so dearly need in the building of the world. Born in a border state, I began as a young woman after the Civil War to ask whether there were not ways through our difficulties other than war. Later in a community of the north, when I heard voices raised against the social implications of the emancipation of the Negro—then I recognized that the victorious in arms would always necessarily be the vanquished in spirit.

War is the symptom of a deep-seated pathology. We need to take our lesson from modern medicine which first diagnoses and then treats the focal infection thus located. Diagnosis and treatment must replace vengeance in human relationships. Everywhere force defeats itself.

We women and social workers in 1914-1916 knew what war meant, war in the world and our American participation in it; yet in those days not even Jane Addams was heard. Today it is a war which no one wants to claim.

We are in another warfare today, for we realize that economic force must be prevented in the warfare between workers and employees. We must develop devices for controlling this exploitation in a civilization controlled by industry and business. How can we work for peace between nations save as we work also against the exploitation of economic forces and racial prejudices? There is one meaning to the Arkansas and the Scottsboro cases: Under our free constitution rights which should have been shared by all but which have been un-

II. Dr. Aurelia Henry Reinhardt

MAY I recall to you some points in this conference which to me seem significant. I have gleaned them as an educator who has faith in the possibilities of growth in people, who believes that the development of reason as a light for individual and national conduct is the task of education. We have been reminded that business and commerce have taken on the vocabulary of military ambition and military success. In like manner education has taken on the vocabulary of the commercial world: we are told to "sell education" to the American people, to "put a high cost" on education, to "put our wares in the show windows" of our schools. I shall remember this and determine to see that we shall enrich the content of education so that our young people will not be tempted to think of it in terms of military success or commercial advantage. Only as we educate the body, mind and spirit shall we develop individuals who will be able to meet new problems.

Democracy brings us not only the heritage of liberty but also the responsibility of safeguarding that heritage; you can have only as much of the one as of the other. In safeguarding that heritage we must learn to share our responsibility. I am reminded of my gratitude for Mr. Einstein; one can be grateful to him without completely understanding him. He taught us that the static mind is not the natural mind, that our problem is always a problem of growth; that life has certain rela-

activities Let us grow in wisdom as we grow in stature, seeing the eternal relationship of things Our problem is a problem of growth, in what direction are we moving, to what goal?

III. Mrs. August Belmont

I REPRESENT no organization, no group opinion, I represent the average individual. From 1917 to the present time I have served with the American Red Cross, in the days of the War I walked through miles of hospitals and since then I have traveled thousands of miles in the United States, talking with all kinds of people In the light of all this experience I cannot believe that it was the international bankers alone who led us into war Can we forget how our passions were aroused by the outraged neutrality of Belgium, by the fact that the Germans began the use of poison gas, by the sinking of the Lusitania? No, we were led to war by our own passions, our own delusions Our shame is, however, not so much that we went into the war but that since the war we have failed so miserably to secure a real and lasting peace Where is the prophet who can tell us how the world would have changed had America joined the League? It may be that the League is not a perfect instrument, but was the original motor car so perfect? If we destroy the League of Nations a new generation will have to devise a similar instrument Without such an instrument the desire for peace is an empty order for the waves to stand still

How can the United States isolate itself by a neutrality whose privileges even now seem extremely doubtful? If civilization is to advance let us contribute to it. Face to face with issues of importance to the future of this country how can we adopt a neutrality of isolation?

It is hard for us to think clearly in these times of noisy prejudice We need a leadership of intellect, accurate information Yet our leaders are too often controlled by their desire for power; our information by radio, film and newspaper is a strange half-mixture of truth Democracy is still the great adventure of the modern world. If Democracy fails it probably will be for lack of self-control. Yet it may be

THE NEW EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Carrie Chapman Catt, *Honorary Chairman*.
Josephine Schain, *Chairman*.
Henrietta Roelofs, *Vice Chairman*.
Mrs. William Dick Sporborg, *Recording Secretary*.

Mrs. Edgerton Parsons, *Treasurer*.
Mrs. Kendall Emerson.
Mrs. Frederic Beggs.
Mrs. Robert S. Powell.
Mrs. May Bell Harper.
Mrs. Fred S. Bennett.
Miss Esther G. Ogden.
Mrs. Leslie M. Crichton.
Mrs. Maurice N. Weyl.
Miss Louise McCracken.
Miss Alves Long.
Miss Louise Bache.
Dr. Emily Hickman.
Miss Anna Lord Strauss.

that we shall develop an aristocracy of character as among nations as well as for individuals It may be that we shall secure "the free poise of undisturbed judgment," Mr Wilson's hope for our country

IV. Henry F. Grady

INTERNATIONAL trade is not a factor making either for peace or war, but it may do either depending upon how it is conducted The exchange of goods between people assumes benefits for both parties It is only when a trade or investment is based on preference or special advantage that the elements of struggle enter in To seek preference or special advantage implies the securing of something which belongs to another, countries go to war for a "place in the sun" or for prestige The program of trade agreements now under way in the present Administration is based on "the unconditional most-favored nation principle", it strikes at the concept of preference and special advantage and is the antithesis of struggle and conflict The trade agreements program, therefore, and every other effort to develop sound methods and the principle of non-discrimination in international

economic affairs represents a contribution to world peace.

KATHLEEN D. COURTNEY

Here is a story which you may use effectively in your work A friend of mine, calling on an acquaintance of hers, saw on the walls of the living room a decoration made up of African weapons "Have you a son in Africa?" she asked "No, I just bought them at the second-hand shop because I thought that they would make the home so cozy" I say to you that the job of women is to build up a different idea as to what makes the home cozy Our homes, our nations, will not be made cozy by the accumulation of arms We want a different kind of coziness. You may be able to use this story as builders of peace.

» » » »

BOOK LIST

Books recommended to the delegates

Can We Be Neutral? by Allen W. Dulles and Hamilton Fish Armstrong (Council on Foreign Relations, 45 East 65th Street, New York)

International Security (The American Role in Collective Action for Peace) by Philip C Jessup (Council on Foreign Relations)

By Pacific Means (the Implementation of Article Two of the Pact of Paris) by Manley O Hudson, Yale University Press

Peace and the Plain Man by Sir Norman Angell (Harper).

Mars His Idiot by H M Tomlinson (Harper)
An Atlas of European History by J F Horrabin (Knopf).

Raw Materials, Population Pressure and War by Sir Norman Angell (World Peace Foundation), Ready February 1.

Facing Two Ways by Baroness Shidzue Ishimoto (Farrar & Rinehart)

My Country and My People by Lin Yutang (Reynal & Hitchcock).

The Life of Jane Addams by Linn (Appleton-Century).

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEETS

Information on and extra copies of the Delegate's Worksheet may be secured by writing to the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, Headquarters, 1624 Grand Central Terminal Building, New York City

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

TWELFTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR, PALMER HOUSE,
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, JANUARY 26 TO JANUARY 29 (INCLUSIVE), 1937

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

NO. 1

TUESDAY MORNING SESSION

Presiding, JOSEPHINE SCHAIN

A Short Review of the Activities of the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War

By JOSEPHINE SCHAIN

IN 1924 Mrs. Ben Hooper of Wisconsin gave a luncheon in Buffalo at the time when one of the national organizations was holding its convention. The purpose as stated in the invitation was to discuss ways in which women's organizations might coordinate their international work. After that meeting Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt agreed to head a committee representative of the different groups to formulate a plan of work. The result was the first Conference on the Cause and Cure of War which was held in Washington, January 18-24, 1925.

That sounds like a very simple thing to do, but even as late as 1925, it was bold indeed. For seven days we pondered over causes of wars and examined the institutions already functioning internationally. At the end of the week the delegates agreed that they could not find a solution to the problem in one conference.

It was decided to set up a continuing committee to make plans for another conference the following year and today we open our twelfth annual meeting. At the first session Mrs. Catt said: "The Conference opens with the conviction, firmly fixed, that war is a relic of barbarism whose abolition should have been achieved years ago. The first aim of this Conference," she stated, "is our own education concerning three points: 1. Why has war continued among men? 2. Why have solemn compacts between nations to end it been so long delayed? 3. Why does the anti-war movement in our own country lag?"

The second aim she gave was the hope that every delegate would transmit to her state and to her local organization the education she had received. The third aim was the formulation of methods of co-operation in order to render the "combined activities of our organizations in the direction of world peace more effective."

The findings of the first conference are challenging. They were reported by two committees, one on the Causes of War

and the other on the Cures of War. The causes of war were classified under thirty-one headings. The committee which made the report stated that "since many of the speakers disagreed as to which were primary and which contributory causes of war, and even disagreed as to what the causes are, this classification cannot express the unanimous judgment of the speakers of the conference." It recommended that "members in this conference undertake unprejudiced and continuous study of the psychological, political, economic and social causes of war."

The Committee on the Cures of War stated in its preamble that "we find that the cure of war requires a permanent international organization as its instrument." It favored certain "political measures which tend toward international security." Among these were the outlawry of war and "international machinery through which such a law can become operative among all nations." "This involves," said the report, "and actually compels, permanent world organization which shall be continuously operative." This committee analyzed the economic forces in their relation to peace and war, and emphasized a program of education "adapted to new ways of life in international relations."

The findings of the first conference is a challenging document, well worth re-studying. Little new has been added to the listing of the causes of war during the past twelve years. Emphases have changed from year to year, but the problem still remains—that of finding a way to substitute peaceful settlement of disputes for the old barbaric method.

However, I do believe there is more understanding. We are surer of our course today than in 1925. Our search for the causes of war may be compared to the work being done today on cancer. The doctors do not know the exact causes of the dread disease, but they continue with their research. In the meantime, decided progress is being made in its cure.

Study has been followed by a desire

for action. Only where there has been unanimous agreement has the Committee on the Cause and Cure of War worked for any legislative measure. It has carried on three campaigns: for the entrance of the United States into the Permanent Court of International Justice, for the ratification of the Pact of Paris, and for disarmament by international agreement.

The delegates have taken resolutions to presidents of the United States and deputations have visited senators in behalf of the World Court.

In 1929, 12,000 meetings were held by the cooperating organizations in behalf of ratification of the Pact of Paris—the so-called Kellogg Pact. Resolutions were passed at these meetings and later taken to the senators. Some of you will remember the excitement when we had the good fortune to be in session in Washington at the time when this measure passed the Senate.

In 1930 we took part in the joint deputation of women from five countries who presented a petition to the Conference for Naval Reduction at London. In 1931 the national committee was represented at Geneva when the Women's Disarmament Committee was organized. In 1932 we joined in the international campaign to secure signatures to a petition to be taken to the Disarmament Conference at Geneva. At this demonstration a petition with 12,000,000 signatures from all over the world was presented calling for reduction of armament by international agreement. Of this number 700,000 signatures were secured from the membership of our eleven organizations.

In celebration of our tenth anniversary, ten regional meetings were held. They were miniature Conferences on the Cause and Cure of War. A book was also published at this time, **Why Wars Must Cease**, containing ten chapters written by ten women, outstanding in their loyalty to the peace movement.

To carry our educational work to the small units, the Marathon Round Table work was started five years ago. Since then it has expanded until this year there are 602 units following two study courses outlined by the National Committee.

Inspired by the manner in which the national organizations were cooperating, state conferences have been held off and on by different states during the last five or six years. This last year sixteen states held

T O D A Y I N P E A C E A N D W A R

ing in their influence and attended by women who have found it possible to attend a national gathering

"But of what avail?" the skeptic may ask. "All this work, all this study, all this effort. Just look at the world today!"

We appreciate that the war spirit still dominates. The race in armament is on in a more gigantic, more insane way than ever before. But I think I see a new element in the situation. There is taking form a world opinion which is calling for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means.

We have not been working alone. Our efforts have been attuned to what has been happening elsewhere. I have attended a number of international conferences the past few years so that I have seen at first hand how this interest is growing. In 1935 I attended the meeting of the International Alliance of Women in Istanbul. I learned that day that peace was the subject closest to the hearts of the Turkish women. With one war after another for seventeen years, that is not to be wondered at.

I went to Brussels this last September to attend the Rassemblement Universel pour la Paix. Lord Cecil of Great Britain and Pierre Cot, Minister for Aviation in France, had called this meeting of peace workers throughout the world. Two thousand or twenty-five hundred delegates were expected. Five thousand came. They came from thirty-eight countries—all intent upon helping to consolidate world opinion and to work out practical means of achieving peace on an international basis.

I went to Buenos Aires in November for the Conferencia Popular por la Paz. This was a meeting of people from the South American countries, and who can tell how widespread its influence will be. Just the other day I had a letter from a group of women in Uruguay saying they were going to have a peace conference in about six months' time. Already the leaven of the Buenos Aires Conference has begun to work.

A letter from Kathleen Courtney this week brings news of the activities of the Women's Peace Crusade in Great Britain, a federation similar to our own.

Next summer the Pan-Pacific Women's Association meets at Vancouver. Here problems of the Pacific will be discussed by representatives living in that section of the world.

When in Geneva in September, I attended a two-day conference of the Women's Peace and Disarmament Committee which was organized in 1931. Here representatives of seventeen women's international organizations met and discussed problems similar to those we shall be discussing this week.

So round the world—an influence new in the history of man is beginning to bestir itself. Through all this study, through all these conferences, through all this groping

understanding is being developed among the peoples of the world. I have the faith to believe that a new world order is being molded. I refuse to believe that man has built up a Frankenstein he cannot control.

In 1925 we said, in the findings of the Conference: "We find that the cure of war requires a permanent international organization as its instrument." Each year since then we have reaffirmed that belief. Last year we placed "special emphasis on the relation of policies of the United States to the collective efforts of other nations to

live in peace." If there is one conclusion we have acknowledged consistently in our thinking, it has been that the solution of the war problem can be found only on an international basis.

As we discuss "Today in Peace and War," let us keep in mind this fundamental fact: There is no solution to the war problem except on an international basis. With us, as citizens, rests the responsibility to see that the policies of our government do not run counter to the efforts being made to establish a world order on a peace basis.

Outstanding Political Events of the Year Affecting the War Problem

By RAYMOND LESLIE BUELL

BEHIND the headlines of war and revolution lie two fundamental facts. The first fact is that nearly every country of Europe is undergoing a social transformation, the result of which will not be a Communist Utopia, but a better world, based upon a greater degree of economic security and social justice, and a lessening of class distinctions. The second fact is that the world today is liquidating an unequal peace settlement made at the end of the World War.

Germany today is attempting to tear up the unequal provisions in the Treaty of Versailles. Most of these have already now disappeared. The question which confronts the world is whether Germany having torn up this peace structure will go further and attempt to establish its supremacy in Central Europe. The German campaign in this direction, marked by economic penetration, propaganda and diplomatic bargaining has met with failure. France and other states cannot accede to the German demand for domination in Central Europe because it will mean the extinction of Czechoslovakia, which is the only democracy in Central Europe, and will hasten the advent of war between Russia and Germany.

Consequently Germany, to obtain its ends, must be prepared to wage a war. Notwithstanding its present war economy, Germany today is weaker than in 1914. Despite its anti-communist agreements with Japan and Italy, Germany has no real allies. France and England are daily growing stronger. The tendency of the Little Entente to disintegrate has been checked. Poland has moved back to the anti-German camp. Mussolini will not allow Hitler to dominate Central Europe.

To advance his ends Hitler has launched his crusade against bolshevism. Many people believe that this war against bolshevism is simply an instrument for advancing Germany's imperialist ends, but Hitler is sincere in his fanatical hatred of communism, and so far this war has really worked against German interests. Thus the anti-communist pact with Japan has alienated

both Britain and America, and the premature recognition of France, if he is defeated, will lead to the first real humiliation suffered by Nazi Germany. The non-intervention agreement with regard to Spain, had it only been enforced, was a sincere effort to prevent Europe from being divided into two ideological blocs. Fundamentally, however, the real division in Europe today is not between the fascist and communist states, but between the dictatorships and the democracies.

The second dominant fact in Europe today is social transformation. The old social order which existed for the benefit of a few people is giving way to a new order which is reducing class distinctions and increasing the general standard of living. I believe that some form of capitalism will remain as the basis for the new world order in most countries, but it will be a capitalism, tempered by state intervention, for a common good.

This social transformation is taking place, with varying degrees of success, both in the democracies and the dictatorships. It has gone furthest in the Scandinavian countries. These countries have the highest standard of living in Europe and are probably the world's most successful democracies.

In Britain this same social transformation is taking place, but still more slowly. Today the country is occupied with such problems as nutrition and housing. A year ago France seemed to be dying of anemia, but today it is showing dynamic qualities. The conservatives shout that recovery is impossible under a socialist prime minister, but recovery is slowly taking place.

Other countries are attempting to solve the social problem by revolutionary means. The only states in Europe which are moving rapidly into socialism are the fascist states. Germany is carrying out many interesting social experiments the effect of which is to strengthen the middle class, particularly in the country, and to diminish class distinction. Nevertheless, the Nazi régime will fail in achieving its social objec-

tives unless it expands by force or accepts an international settlement which will meet German economic needs

There is the danger that we in the United States should forget our share of responsibility for the present crisis and believe that we can escape from a European war by adopting a policy of negative isolation. Today it is the fashion to believe that we can avoid being drawn into a new European war by adopting so-called mandatory neutrality legislation and giving up foreign trade with warring nations. In fact, there are at least three reasons why the United States would find it difficult to keep out of a European war if it lasts very long.

First, the debates in our last Congress demonstrate that the United States is not willing to abandon its old doctrine of the freedom of the seas. We are not willing to give up all our neutral rights or our foreign trade—which is necessary if we really hope to insulate ourselves against war.

Second, the American belief in democracy and liberty and the hatred of fascism in many circles will give rise to a strong demand in favor of America's entrance into a war on the side of the democratic powers, should they reach the point of being overwhelmed in a war by fascist opponents.

Third, an even larger number of Americans will probably come to believe that if the three fascist dictatorships succeed in dominating Europe and the Orient these states will inevitably turn greedy eyes upon the Western Hemisphere—Latin America, the Caribbean, and even Canada—and thus injure the vital interests of the United States. From this standpoint, the British Empire and, to a lesser extent, France constitute the first line of defense of North America. Should this line begin to crumble, many Americans who now oppose war in the abstract would demand entry into the war as a measure of self-defense.

The adoption of neutrality legislation which will weaken France and England in their struggle against the three world dictatorships will increase pressure within America to come to the aid of the democracies and thus, paradoxically enough, hasten our entrance into the next war. The wisest neutrality policy is not mandatory embargoes, but the cash and carry system.

In view of this grave danger the only sure means of keeping out of war is to assist in preventing it from breaking out. Although war is not imminent, a deadlock exists in Europe today. President Roosevelt is in a unique position to break the existing deadlock between the two great democracies and the three great dictatorships. Is it too much to expect that such a result might be obtained from a six-power economic conference in Washington?

Unless a constructive political and economic settlement is soon made between Germany and the outside world, the outbreak of a general war during the next few years is not unlikely.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Presiding, MRS. AUSTIN L. KIMBALL

SANCTIONS

By MRS. LAURA PUFFER MORGAN

I WOULD like to begin my discussion of sanctions—their operation, effect and prospects for the future—by quoting a definition of sanctions given by the delegate from Mexico at the meeting of the Committee of Eighteen on December 13, 1935. November 18, 1935, he said, had marked the beginning of one of the most important international experiments that the modern world had ventured to undertake in favor of peace. Fifty-one nations had put into force as from that date the various economic and financial sanctions proposed—"not as an act of hostility against the Italian people, but as a means of preventing a great Power from continuing to violate the principles of the Covenant, which the majority of Governments rightly regarded as an indispensable means of strengthening collective security and promoting international welfare."

Delays loomed large on this side of the water. It should be remembered that this was the first attempt to apply sanctions, and although the States which were bound by the Covenant had been urged under the Assembly resolution of 1921 to take the necessary legislative steps which would enable them to enforce at short notice any measures of economic pressure which might be decided upon, they had failed to do so. Consequently, many Governments, when faced for the first time with the practical problem of applying Article 16, found themselves confronted with difficulties of a constitutional character which took some time to straighten out. The date finally fixed for the entry of sanctions was adopted, a delay which seems not unreasonable in view of the circumstances, but which was serious enough when one considers that the war was already six weeks under way and had its effect on the results ultimately attained.

A simple list of the main committees and the meetings held by them between October 11, 1935, and July 6, 1936, when the sanctions were lifted, will give some indication of the seriousness with which the problem was tackled. The large Co-ordination Committee held three sessions with six meetings, the Committee of Eighteen, the working committee, held five sessions, covering twenty meetings, the last one being held on March 4, 1936. The Committee of Experts created to follow the application of sanctions held four sessions between November 27 and April 21, covering twenty meetings, and the Committee of Experts on Petroleum held two sessions covering twelve meetings

between February 3 and March 7, 1936. This list does not include meetings of subcommittees, for which minutes were not taken.

"But," I imagine your saying at this point, "if the sanctions were so effectively and seriously applied, why did they fail?" The sanctions adopted did not fail in themselves. In fact, they were far more effective than anyone had foreseen. The failure lay rather in the political calculations of certain foreign ministers, in the estimates of the military experts on the length of the military campaign required to conquer Ethiopia, and in the choice of sanctions adopted to meet the emergency.

There were three States closely bound to Italy by political and economic ties, which had refused to apply sanctions—the vassal States they were called in Geneva—Albania, Austria and Hungary, and other powerful States not members of the League. Although the attitude of the non-member States was on the whole encouraging, the fact that the system of sanctions could not be complete, affected very materially the choice of the measures adopted.

Since each State has the sovereign right to decide for itself which sanctions it will apply, the Committee of Eighteen found itself faced with the necessity of choosing those measures on which there was unanimous agreement, for otherwise the sanctions would not be effective. No one conceived that the economic and financial measures adopted would have an immediate effect.

The theory was that the real pressure of the sanctions would lie in the warning given to Mussolini that if he persisted in his aggression he would eventually come up against their full force and that this warning would have full time in which to work, for no military expert conceded him a military victory under two years. It was the military experts, not the financial ones, that were proved wrong and upset the whole plan.

The sanctions finally adopted on October 19 were, Proposal I, an embargo on arms, ammunition and implements of war; II, an embargo on loans and credits; III, a boycott on all Italian goods; IV, an embargo on certain exports to Italy, including some key minerals such as aluminum, manganese, tin, etc., and V, the organization of mutual support to minimize the sacrifices on the part of those imposing sanctions.

In short, there was a highly significant cooperative effort, made at considerable sacrifice to themselves, by fifty-two nations, showing concrete results sooner than had been expected, but not soon enough to gain the objective of prevent-

ing the conquest of Ethiopia. But was this the only objective? The delegate from Mexico said that the purpose of sanctions was to prevent the continued violation of the Covenant—a violation which certainly did not cease with the taking of Addis Ababa. It seems a tragic thing that this experiment, which might have proved once for all the value of sanctions and the soundness of the principle of collective security, was not allowed to continue to a show-down.

What is the future of sanctions? Will they be attempted again? I believe the solution will be found in a system of graded economic sanctions that can be applied as needed before an actual conflict breaks out, the more drastic measures being resorted to only in the case when all preventive measures have failed. But before this stage of development is reached, in the words of M. Avenol, secretary-general of the League, "there must be a moral and psychological cure at the sources of will."

Proposals for Reform of the League of Nations

By WALTER H C LAVES

THE chief cause for current discussion on reform of the League of Nations Covenant is to be found in the failure of members of the League in preventing the annexation of Ethiopia by Italy. Some nations are trying to blame this failure upon the terms of the Covenant. Others are hoping to strengthen the League in order to hold potential aggressors in check.

People are prone to sit in judgment on the League and to judge it by higher standards than other organizations. They are like people who damn the politicians, but won't accept civic responsibility themselves. Success of any organization just as of any government depends on continual participation and continual acceptance of responsibility. The League of Nations inevitably supports the status quo, just as government is committed to maintaining the status quo.

It must not be forgotten, however, that the Covenant of the League has been amended on many occasions in the past, but most of these amendments have dealt with procedural questions.

Most governments are opposed to fundamental changes in the League. Most governments feel that it is important to have a universal league. Some have suggested regionalizing the League, that is, have a League for Europe, a League for the Americas, a League for the Far East, etc.

A special League commission is now at work considering in detail the proposals submitted by many governments since

last July. These proposals are in answer to a request from the Secretary-General sent out last summer following a resolution of the July Assembly. The responses of the governments have been printed by the League of Nations in a single volume.

While the proposals for reform deal with a great many different questions they are primarily concerned with two:

- 1 How to make the League of Nations universal while at the same time making sanctions effective in the event of future acts of aggression. The trouble here is that some countries will not cooperate unless there are sufficient guarantees of sanctions in defense of rights, while other countries will not come into the League if participation in sanctions is required. A compromise may be found by regionalizing responsibility for sanctions, that is, by providing that actual sanctions will be embodied only by the countries most vitally interested, such as the Far East, the Americas, Western Europe, Eastern Europe. There would have to be a general obligation for all nations not to pursue policies which might interfere with the principle of collective security embodied in the League Covenant or in the Kellogg-Briand Pact.

- 2 How to provide for peaceful change by which to reflect legitimate aspirations of some countries. Here the difficulty lies in the fact that any institution like the League tends to perpetuate the status quo and that its failure to permit change is the greatest obstacle to the preservation of peace.

All countries realize that the League must go on and all of them know that the chief weakness of the League lies in the unwillingness of some countries to carry out their obligations. Moreover, all countries are aware that there is no sense in seeking a solution in the creation of a totally new League. They are convinced that the fundamental issues now facing the present League would survive.

It is difficult to determine along what lines we may expect action from the League this year. If the international situation changes, the issue of Covenant reform may go into the background. The future, I believe, will bring an increasing recognition of the need of a universal League—a regular channel through which nations may discuss recurring problems. Perhaps this will mean reducing the obligations of member nations and finding a least common denominator on which all nations can come together. Universality is more important than strong sanctions. There will be no very great change in the structure of the League this year—probably some slight change in Article XI. Above all, we need the will to prevent war on the part of members and non-members of the League.

WHO'S WHO ON THE PROGRAM

RAYMOND LESLIE BUELL, President, Foreign Policy Association

WALTER H C LAVES, Director, Mid-West League of Nations Association

LAURA PUFFER MORGAN, Special European Representative of the National Council for the Prevention of War

Note. The address on "Currency Alignment and Trade Restrictions" by W. W. Waymack will be printed in the next DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET.

Presentation of Program

THE Program Committee proposes to the conference that the adoption of the program of the conference for 1937 proceed along the following lines. First, the proposed program for 1936 adopted at the eleventh conference is an inclusive program and is applicable for 1937. The committee proposes, therefore, that the conference re-adopt this 1936 program as its 1937 program, making any additions or amendments which seem necessary. One addition will certainly be a recommendation for the ratification of the agreements reached at Buenos Aires. The program for 1936 included a general statement of aims and recommendations for support and study and proposed projects of work. It is open to the objection of being an inclusive program in which immediate emphases are lost.

The Program Committee believes that at this time the conference needs two or three outstanding emphases singled out. For the purpose of getting these, the committee is suggesting that Thursday noon the delegates hand in a concise five-point program. Three of these points should deal with matters which require immediate governmental action. Two might deal with far-looking issues which might require either governmental action or study. The committee would then collate these suggestions and bring to the conference, Friday afternoon, a report on these emphases and recommendations embodying the issues of the conference. These, when adopted, would form the basis of the recommendations of the conference to the member organizations, urging upon those organizations action, study, and education in behalf of these matters involved.—DR EMILY HICKMAN

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEETS

Information on and extra copies of the Delegate's Worksheet may be secured by writing to the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War Headquarters, 1622 Grand Central Terminal Building, New York City.

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

TWELFTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR, PALMER HOUSE,
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, JANUARY 26 TO JANUARY 29 (INCLUSIVE), 1937

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

NO. 2

TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Presiding, MRS. AUSTIN L. KIMBALL

(Continued from Worksheet No. 1)

Currency Alignment and Trade Restrictions

By W. W. WAYMACK

THE century, roughly speaking, prior to the world war gave a dramatic demonstration of what is possible—or was possible—to do in stepping up wealth production, raising general living standards and creating the material bases on which free institutions can expand. These marvels were achieved through industrialization, specialization, division of labor and relatively free commercial interchange.

To meet the needs of the new order the old practices and philosophy of mercantilism were abandoned. Under mercantilism, wealth was confused with money, a "favorable" trade balance was regarded as the test of national well-being, exports were considered desirable and imports economically sinful, and governments sharply restricted and closely regulated all commerce across national borders. Under the new philosophy of "let-alone" liberalism, the grip of governments on trade was broken, traders were given carte blanche, and the theory was developed that under such free play of "economic law" the pursuit of private profit by individuals would inevitably result in the maximum benefit to the social group.

After the war an attempt was made, as Sir Arthur Salter has so well explained, to go back almost in toto to the liberal technique. Currencies were reconnected with gold. Production and trade enthusiastically expanded. The world began to consider that it was again "on its way."

In our own country, even, where the pressures, political, military and economic, have been much less, a cult of economic nationalism aiming at semi-self-containment has appeared.

I suggest four questions that call for amplification:

1. How is the new mercantilism, with its motive of self-sufficiency and military security, working out?

2. How much of the post-war order as to international trade must be taken as permanent adjustment to altered conditions, and how much may be expected to slough off as the depression wanes?

3. What about America's rôle, both in causing the world debacle and in seeking restoration? In connection with that, what about this "unconditional most-favored-na-

tion clause" in its relation to our policies?

4. What about the currency stabilization as a step toward whatever tomorrow has in store?

Granting that currency devaluations as well as the import quotas, export subsidies, blocked foreign exchange and so on were in many cases defensive, imposed on financially weak countries by the blind policies of the strong, we must recognize that these restrictions have been adopted also for quite other ends. Taking Germany with her four-year plan of making herself independent of war supplies from other nations as the outstanding, though by no means only example, we have the deliberate effort to become militarily self-sufficient.

Dismissing Germany as the extreme example, and treating the autarchic idea in general, three points must be made.

First, the whole technique of it is one of restriction of trade and one which tends to lessen trade. By reducing the volume of exchange of goods it tends to lessen purchasing power and standards of living not only at home but everywhere. Even for military purposes its tendency to reduce peace-time domestic prosperity is a weakening, not a strengthening factor. It tends to make depression perpetual, at least by comparison with the realizable gains of larger trade. And in any case it is unattainable, since even vast and rich countries like America and Russia cannot be wholly self-sufficient, and the concept of fifty countries, most of them small, becoming self-sufficient is preposterous. World empire is the real logic of the self-sufficiency doctrine.

Second, autarchy, precisely like moderate economic protectionism, feeds on itself. It creates vested interests. The original list of exceptions to the program of self-sufficiency—products that temperate zone countries do not have—tends or would tend to be constantly enlarged. "Ersatz" products, costly and in most cases less satisfactory, will engender disappointments. The inevitable result must be intensified political rivalry for possession of the areas where the essential products are

to be had, as well as for naval and air power over the sea routes imperative for their transportation. In short, the notion that in autarchy lies an ameliorative for the risks and frictions of economic imperialism seems very highly illusory.

Third, while some persons stress the fact that "planning" or governmental controls within the nation may make imperative a degree of additional planning and governmental control of international trade, the converse is also true. Let us but reconcile ourselves to the new mercantilism in international trade, highly restrictive and with governments taking the place of private traders in every vital respect, and we shall have given such a momentum to forces making for economic governmental totalitarianism—regimentation if you like—with in even the democratic nations as such nations have not yet dared think of.

The United States unquestionably shares responsibility both for the post-war economic collapse and for the unprecedented severity of it. As a creditor nation it was our rôle to overhaul our import policies and permit our debtors to pay not only for our exports but also interest and amortization on our debt claims with goods and services. But habit and vested interests were too strong for that. In the early 1920's we increased our tariff barriers.

To set against this we have the more recent record of our State Department's policies. The more it is viewed in the light of circumstances the more praise-worthy it appears. We have refused to go in for trade restrictions other than tariffs (save for some tariff quotas utilized not to restrict trade but to safeguard its workable expansion). We have pressed for trade treaties bilateral in form but general in their purpose, based on inclusion of the unconditional most-favored-nation clause. The clause generalizes concessions to all nations that do not discriminate against us. It assures to our export industries every favor that other nations subscribing to it may subsequently extend to yet other nations.

We have contributed again tremendously through the currency realignment. It is easy to deprecate the achievement. True, it is not stabilization. True, each nation holds itself free, if it should prove that its internal economic equilibrium is endangered, to withdraw without imputation of bad faith on twenty-four hours' notice. True, the principle of internal stability is put first and external stability second,

T O D A Y I N P E A C E A N D W A R

which must be the case. But it is a genuine international effort. There have come about, by action of the devaluing nations, some hopeful reductions already on both quotas and tariffs to compensate for the devaluing (which is not yet definitive). And it is plain that cautious beginnings are being made toward resettlement of international debts, which is the logical next step in preparation for stabilization that can be expected to stay stable. I will only suggest that in the long run, because of its rooted strength in the traditions of men, gold will have to be the basis of real international stabilization.

The real significance of the currency agreement lies in its international cooperative character. How resistless are the forces that lead to this is surely suggested by the fact that the United States, in a time of probably its maximum psychological recoil from international commitments,

has not only found itself involved in cooperative and consultative action in the probably long-term management of the world's media of exchange, but that it has moved into this commitment with the acquiescence and applause of practically every articulate interest from Maine to California.

Finally, as to this phase, let it be said that the ultimate solvent of the problem of peace and the inextricably related problem of trade is still what it seemed before. Not totalitarianism, but democratic processes. Not autarchy, but workable freedom of exchange. Not passionate nationalism, but intelligent, slow qualification of the principle of sovereignty. Not a backward trek to the self-sufficiency of a clan whose horizons are a range of hills and a river too deep to ford, but an evolving recognition of a world community.

It is a far-off goal, but it is the only goal there is.

Force of all types—new forms of force

Is this a theory to freeze status quo?

Does *law* (peace) come first, or *justice*?

(Can Article 19 function if there is no faith in Article 10?)

IX The chaos of the peace movement

Two wings. Building law. Moral anarchism.

Problem calls for *organization* discipline, predictable consequences.

History of domestic law on peace vs justice issue.

Various theories not mutually exclusive. Must work on many points.

Keep an eye on possible economic causes like tariffs, munitions trade, etc.

Keep an eye on possible reduction of a neutral's causes of friction: cash-and-carry system.

But keep-an-eye-on-the-ball — *Building law*

TUESDAY EVENING SESSION

Presiding, MRS ROBERTA CAMPBELL LAWSON

Can It Happen Again?

University of Chicago Round Table with HARRY D. GIDEONSE, Associate Professor of Economics, CLIFTON UTLEY, Director, Council on Foreign Relations; QUINCY WRIGHT, Professor, International Law. This is the outline which was used by the members of the Round Table in their discussion.

CAN IT HAPPEN AGAIN?

I. Why shouldn't it?

War—a trait in our culture.
Nothing so far indicates that we are ready to pay the price involved in its eradication, or even in its control.

A variety of "theories":
Man-likes-war theory.
Devil (or mad dog) theory.
The capitalism-is-war theory.
The preparedness-is-peace theory.
The insist-on-neutrality theory.
The outlawry-of-war theory.
The organize-for-war theory.

II. Man-likes-war theory

III. Devil (or mad dog) theory

IV. The capitalism-is-war theory

Theories of war: religious, dynastic, economic, glandular.

Does giving government more power reduce possibilities of inter-governmental conflict?

there reason to assume that increasing centralization of national power will be accompanied by will to curb national power (sovereignty)?

V. The preparedness-is-peace theory

1914—and all that.
The short-run validity of the thesis, 1936-38.

VI. The insist-on-neutrality theory

Based on the theory that trade with belligerents makes war easily the dominant U. S. A. theory today.
The historical evidence: "tried" and "tested" ideas.

"Improving" the experience of the past.

"Discretionary" and "mandatory" neutrality.

Neutrality—not a "peace" policy—merely a save-your-hide policy.

Prevention-of-war vs what-you-do-when-there-is-a-war.

"Mandatory" neutrality—the greatest gold brick sold to the peace movement since the war.

VII. The outlawry-of-war theory

The Kellogg Pact—and the missing link.

"Sanctions" and the history of law (English, U. S. A.).

Moral suasion not suasive in 1937.

VIII. The organize-for-war theory

What "organize" means—spell it out.

The Covenant idea—was it ever tried?

Law depends upon force somewhere—some friends of the League do it a disservice by disguising the fact.

Ten Outstanding Books Published During 1936

Recommended to the Twelfth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War

From the large number of books on Peace or War, the following are recommended because each makes a specific contribution to the peace movement.

1. **Why We Went to War:** by Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War, 1916-1921. Harper & Bros., New York City. 1936. 199 pp. \$1.50
2. **The Far-Eastern Crisis** by Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of State, 1929-1933. Harper & Bros., New York City. 1936. 293 pp. \$3.75
3. **Inside Europe** by John Gunther (Completely revised). Harper & Bros., New York City. 1936. 468 pp. \$3.50
4. **A Place in the Sun** by Grover Clark. The Macmillan Co., New York City. 1936. 233 pp. \$2.50
5. **We or They.** by Hamilton Fish Armstrong. The Macmillan Co., New York City. 1936. 106 pp. \$1.50
6. **Vital Peace:** by Henry Wickham Steed. The Macmillan Co., New York City. 1936. 346 pp. \$2.75
7. **On the Rim of the Abyss:** by James T. Shotwell, Ph.D., LL.D. The Macmillan Co., New York City. 1936. 400 pp. \$3.00
8. **Anti-Semitism:** by Hugo Valentin. The Viking Press, New York City. 1936. 324 pp. \$3.00
9. **And We Are Civilized:** by Wolfgang Ackermann. Covici Friede, New York City. 1936. 276 pp. \$2.50
10. **War:** Drawings and Etchings, by Kerr Eby. Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1936. \$2.50

WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

Presiding, MRS. CARROLL SUDLER

Current Economic Theories in Conflict: The Effect on the War Situation in Europe and the World

International Economic Life

By C DOUGLAS BOOTH

IT IS a well-established notion that this world of nations is an interdependent field of economic action. Recent and even long past history confirms the fact of conflict both economic and political, as well as the dependence of one upon the other. This conflict in essence is a conflict between the objective fact of world economic interdependence and national economic policies which fail to take this interdependence into account.

The diversities between areas as respects natural resources and technical development require intelligent cooperation to create maximum prosperity in unity. But exaggerated nationalism and imperialism guide the diversities not toward unity, but toward profit and power of a few groups and a few governments, at the expense of the rest.

We have found the secret of science in mass production, but we have not yet secured justice in distribution. We have rationalized the technique of man without knowing what man is. This is the office of metaphysics. What man ought to do is the office of ethics, which is a practical science having to do with the notion of freedom.

In the liberal democracies the state had for its essential office the preservation of something given, namely, the free will of man, in such a way that all possible acts of free choice might be available with no other restriction on this freedom save that man was not to hinder a similar freedom on the part of his neighbor. In international terms this became sovereignty and a mutual respect of sovereignties. Inside the national community the state was supposed to be an umpire in the battle of benevolent competition. In the world community there was no umpire, and in neither was the competition benevolent. The essential values of social and of international justice were forgotten. The tragedy of freedom of choice regarded as an end in itself was unfolded in chaos. The absolute right of each man to realize his choice, or of each nation to act upon the doctrine of sovereignty, tends naturally to dissolve in an anarchy of sovereignties which precludes the realization of freedom in national or international society. In fact, to avoid embarrassments of the most serious kind, compensating mechanisms of the empirical order have been brought into play, which in their turn have tended to reduce to a legal fiction the ideal of freedom of choice which at the beginning had been presented as an absolute principle.

In international life these compensating mechanisms were not introduced soon enough, or with sufficient vigor, to save us from catastrophe.

In every democracy today there is a fatal fascination in the notion of "self-sufficiency." When this fascination is supported by the possession of a vast quantity and variety of natural resources, we find the idea of self-containment coupled with that of isolation, manifesting itself in almost fantastic proposals.

What shall we say of the new economic régimes which accompany new state forms in Europe? Here we have a somewhat different philosophy based, not upon freedom of choice which may be called initial freedom, but upon freedom of autonomy or terminal freedom. This type of philosophy, whether it be Hegelian as in Germany or inverted Hegelian as in Russia, conceives freedom as a type of transitive action, expressing itself in the realization of power as an end. It is at the hands of the state or the political community that this philosophy seeks its fulfilment in history. It now makes its way steadily in the world as fascism, nazism and communism. In the two former, we have what approaches dedication of the state, as the source of all human rights and the focus of all human activities. In communism the state as God is replaced by "society" a collective God of a billion arms for the sake of which men will relinquish freedom of choice for the inestimable privilege of becoming happy slaves of social utility in the temporal and material order.

In the field of economics the effects of fascism, communism and nazism should, by reason of somewhat different theories of value, be diverse. But immediate circumstances have forced Italy, Germany and Russia into the use of almost identical means. Again we have, and quite naturally too, the struggle for self-sufficiency justified by the notion of power.

In Europe we see the disintegration of terms and of principles which seem to us to be written in the nature of things. Justice, freedom, veracity, charity, and honor have become nationalized. Even legal concepts formerly of universal application now are confined within national boundaries. This matter is more serious than we think, for how are we to exchange products or assume obligations of an international character, if we cannot exchange ideas? What hope have we of reconciling national economic policies to the fact of interdependence, if, in the name of the state as Power, we deny the existence of man as an intellectual being and moral person?

But, all is not lost. The democracies, although they do not agree, at least understand and agree upon the meaning of terms. Even in the dictatorships, the leaven of sanity works slowly underground. In due time, we shall eliminate the poisons of pragmatism and materialism, and the caravan of humanity will again resume its march toward the destiny to which it is called.

Why War?

By PRESTON SLOSSON

WE HAVE no lack of theories on the subject of what causes war but unfortunately many of them are superficial and inadequate. Thus some say that there will always be war because man is by nature a combative animal, the survivor of a thousand massacres, more like the lion than the sheep. Modern war is not primitive hand to hand fighting. It is a complex political and industrial process involving a great deal of tedious drill and obedience to distasteful orders, and giving only rare and occasional opportunities for belligerent self-expression.

Another oversimplified theory is that war is a mere by-product of finance. Men are naturally peaceful, we are told, until some munitions maker or colonial merchant sees a chance to make a profit out of a war, buys up the press, bribes the politicians, and starts a propaganda campaign for a war. Therefore end capitalism and you will end war. But this is the common error of looking for a personal devil to explain everything that happens amiss. Wars do not happen at random between any nation and any other nation; they take place only where some old embittered rivalry exists or where some recent injury has roused a genuine, though possibly misdirected, public anger. The propagandist is not omnipotent. He is only an advertiser, a salesman, and he can win "customers" for his ideas and projects only to the extent to which they appeal to the "market." To make the munitions manufacturer, that parasite on war, the prime cause of war is like saying that there would be no weddings if the jewelers did not want to sell wedding rings!

Another economic interpretation, closer to the fundamentals of the case but still too simple to cover the whole range of truth, is that nations having too little land to support their people must conquer the wealth they lack. The three Powers now most greatly menacing the peace of the world—Germany, Italy and Japan—are all densely settled countries. They believe that they would be better off if they had such vast domains as Britain, France, Russia and the United States. The expansion of Rome, the growth of the British Empire and all other ventures and conquests of history are explained on this theory as the outward thrust of a teeming population. Nor does it matter in the least that the search for

prosperity by conquest and colonization may be the mere will-o'-the-wisp that Norman Angell says it is, delusions may cause war as readily as realities can there be any doubt that Japan entered Manchuria or that Italy entered Ethiopia in the hope that trade would follow the flag?

There is no doubt that rivalry for gold and silver, coal and oil, sugar islands in the West Indies, spice islands in the East Indies, diamonds in the Transvaal, furs around Hudson's Bay, fish off the banks of Newfoundland, warm water ports for Russia, railroad concessions in Turkey have contributed their share to the making of wars. But several very substantial qualifications must be made as to the economic interpretations of war. One is that these vast material stakes of diplomacy have often been adjusted with surprising ease when other complications were not present. Great Britain and Germany had actually reached an agreement covering nearly all the outstanding colonial problems, such as the Bagdad Railway and the Portuguese colonies in Africa, before the World War burst upon them. Granted that the World War might have begun over some such dispute as the Moroccan crisis of 1911, it did in fact begin with a largely sentimental national quarrel between Austria and Serbia in which Great Britain had no material interest whatsoever.

Nor was Germany in any sense of the word "overpopulated" when she declared war on Russia and France. On the contrary her standard of living had been rising rapidly for a whole generation or more and emigration had almost ceased because German labor was profitably employed at home. A big modern war does nothing to relieve overpopulation, because it destroys property at an even greater rate than life and leaves all the belligerents, even the victors, much poorer than before.

Yet the theorists are right in looking for some deeper cause of war than the particular incident which begins hostilities. France and Prussia would hardly have gone to war in 1870 over so trivial an affair as the Ems telegram if the two nations had previously been on friendly terms. Probably no one in Europe was so deeply stirred over the assassination of Francis Ferdinand in 1914 as to wish ten million human sacrifices to honor his tomb. Every year since the armistice some crisis has arisen in European affairs quite grave enough to cause war and yet war did not come. The occasion of a war is almost never the real cause, though it may determine the exact time, place and circumstance when war begins.

Very few people like modern warfare; very rarely do even the most unscrupulous statesmen deliberately plot it. As Professor Namier of Manchester so well put it, there are nowadays more wars of *tension* than wars of *intention*. International war is simply the breakdown of the ordinary processes of diplomacy just as civil war is

the breakdown of the ordinary processes of political government. The whole problem of maintaining peace is to find legal and peaceful solutions for problems as they arise before the atmosphere has become so poisoned by suspicion and resentment that some sudden "untoward incident," as the diplomats would call it, precipitates war.

Various forms of war which have existed in the past have now practically disappeared. Only two types of war remain, the war between nations and the civil war between hostile parties. It is easy to point out in theory the solution for both types of war. There would be no international wars if nations would invariably lay their cases before some legal tribunal, such as the League of Nations or the World Court, and accept its verdict as conclusive. There would be no revolutions or civil wars if all parties would accept as final the verdict of the voters at the ballot box. Internationalism would make national wars superfluous, democracy would make civil war superfluous. Why then do wars still take place?

The answer is that internationalism and democracy are very recent habits of mind and few people have come to think and still fewer to feel in those terms. The nation is for most modern people the emotional center of their lives. They like peace and hate war in the abstract, but they hate still more the idea of letting a foreigner get the better of a bargain, especially when war still seems distant. In every nation the press criticizes its government for being too yielding to foreign governments. Every disarmament agreement is made in the teeth of violent protests on the part of each nation concerned that its weak-minded and incompetent delegates had conceded everything to the other nations!

We cannot stop wars until we find out what starts them. Some current theorists are obviously inadequate, such as the innately warlike "nature of man" and the alleged conspiracies of financiers. Others come closer to the truth, such as the existence of colonial and commercial rivalry. No doubt the "unsaturated" overcrowded states are a menace to peace, and none the less because their hope of obtaining prosperity through conquest may be sheer delusion. But apart from the national pride, suspicion and jealousy which turns all controversies into questions of "prestige," these economic factors are not the most difficult to settle. History shows the possibility of very far-reaching concessions and compromises in such matters as tariffs, colonies, etc., where acute political hostility did not exist. Moreover, no government today really believes that a general European war could be a paying business. The most necessary step is to have the general security of peace, rather than the "diplomatic victory" of some short-sighted, overclever bargain, approved by an enlightened public opinion as the true national honor and national interest.

WHO'S WHO ON THE PROGRAM

C. DOUGLAS BOOTH, Exchange Professor from London, under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

PRESTON SLOSSON, Associate Professor of History, University of Michigan.

W. W. WAYMACK, Editor, Des Moines Register and Tribune

Working Luncheon Conference on Marathon Round Tables

Chairman, MRS. FREDERIC BEGGS

THE luncheon in honor of the State Chairman of Marathon Round Tables was attended by one hundred women who received with enthusiasm the reports of the chairmen, seventeen in number, from the following states:

Mrs. Martin and Mrs. Anderson of Colorado
Mrs. Shurtluff of West Virginia
Mrs. Marx of Illinois
Mrs. Mier of Iowa
Miss Bloye of Indiana
Mrs. Gessell of Kansas
Mrs. Ormond of Michigan
Mrs. Woodhull of Minnesota
Miss Johnson of Missouri
Mrs. Bixler of Ohio
Mrs. Griffith of Wyoming
Miss Bowman of Oklahoma
Mrs. Buland of Oregon
Miss Eaton of Nebraska
Mrs. Franks of Texas
Mrs. Wilson of Florida

(In the absence of Mrs. Maltby, Mrs. Ellys made the report for Washington.)

Mrs. Beggs, the National Chairman of Marathons, presided and the guests of honor were Josephine Schan and Mrs. Edgerton Parsons. Miss Schan expressed her feeling of encouragement because of the splendid work that the women are doing and Mrs. Parsons told of her satisfaction with the fundamental way in which the solution of problems is being sought.

The reports indicated that individual and co-operative work on peace is increasing in a most encouraging manner.

The different projects initiated both by the State Chairmen of Marathons and by local Marathon groups stimulate the imagination. The use of the Marathon material as the foundation for community forums, adult education classes, radio lectures and in many other ways is an evidence of creative thinking and the determination to use all existing channels to carry on this work of developing an "enlightened and effective public opinion."

The chairman called especially for detailed reports of activities in Colorado and Wyoming. Many new methods have originated in Colorado, such as a Library Clipping Bureau, a "Worker's Clearing House," a Round Robin letter through which local chairmen exchange ideas, and a Family Tree Telephone Squad.

Realizing that only the high spots could be touched in so brief a time, the chairman closed the meeting by reminding the women of Miss Schan's thought—that women everywhere in all parts of the world are working with them to the same end—a world where peace can be assured.

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEETS

Information on and extra copies of the Delegate's Worksheet may be secured by writing to the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War Headquarters, 1622 Grand Central Terminal Building, New York City.

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

TWELFTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR, PALMER HOUSE,
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, JANUARY 26 TO JANUARY 29 (INCLUSIVE), 1937

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

NO. 3

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Presiding, AGNES NESTOR

The United Front in the Peace Movement

By WALTER W VAN KIRK

THE peace forces of the United States are more united at the moment than is generally understood even though they vary in opinions and methods. We are united in condemning any individualistic practices of statesmen when questions of race, religion, geography, etc., must be considered in the interests of the world community. For each must be prepared to sacrifice something. Similarly, the peace organizations must be willing to sacrifice something of their opinions in favor of the ends to be gained by cooperation.

The National Peace Conference offers opportunity for such cooperation. It serves as a coordinating agency for the peace movements in this country, a sort of clearing house, in which representatives of the various groups are ready to subordinate personalistic views toward one great end. We are not, as some have tried to say, a group of "quarreling pacifists," we are one in purpose. The conference does not command the groups of which it is composed, it recommends certain policies, procedures and programs to the affiliated groups, and it does not use the name of any one without permission. This common platform—our charter, so to speak—is a notable step in unifying the peace movement.

The peace organizations of this country are gradually developing a strategy by which they may bring the strength of their opinion to bear upon policies which they announce for the country at large. One of the most useful things which the conference has been able to do is to organize delegations and interpret such common statements of program upon which it has jointly agreed.

The conference, with headquarters at 8 West 40th Street, New York City, has been engaged in many kinds of activities in working toward peace. First, it has committees of experts to prepare reports on questions of present import. One on neutrality, headed by Professor Shotwell, gave both majority and minority reports setting forth major considerations. Another committee studied military training in schools

and colleges. "The Economics of Peace" was prepared by fifty-four experts.

Second, we have taken over the publication of the World Affairs pamphlets. "Cotton South and Modern Trade," hailed by cotton authorities as the best thing on the subject, and Marc Rose's, "Primer of Economics and Peace." There are also two other pamphlets in preparation, one by Dr. Samuel Guy Inman on "American Neighbors," and another by Molinowski on "Why War Is Contrary to Human Nature."

Third, we have started a radio program of education, fourth, we are trying to make the peace-movement "politics-conscious"—to take an active part in politics. We have distributed quantities of leaflets and other printed matter during campaigns. We recommended a peace-plank to both Republican and Democratic National Conventions last year.

There are other national peace movements working in the United States. First, the American League Against War and Fascism, which in itself is a federation of peace bodies and is also more to the left than those organizations represented in the National Peace Conference. Communists are identified with them, but are not a controlling factor in the making of the policies of the league. The American League is not now a member of the National Peace Conference and is not likely to become affiliated at the present time.

Second, the Emergency Peace Campaign was brought into existence to meet an emergency. It was carefully stated in the beginning that the campaign was projected for a two-year period which will come to an end in January, 1938. It is made up largely of those who believe in the principles of mandatory and neutrality legislation. The E. P. C. program has its own program, which is not the program of the N. P. C. but the interests of the two converge in the local field.

The future of the National Peace Conference will be determined by the organizations affiliated with it. The N. P. C. provides a vehicle through which coordination along national lines may come about.

The real test of statesmanship of the national peace organizations is to meet the challenge of local committees. I hope that within five years we will have 2,000 local peace councils in this country, not to supplement the present peace efforts of individual organizations but to strengthen them.

We need a united front also in the international field. Many of the cooperating organizations in the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War have international set-ups, as for example the Y. W. C. A. and the W. I. L.

In world, national and local areas unity is being developed. Some think all should have the same idea. Unity without uniformity should be our goal. The people of this country want peace for themselves and for the world. If we cannot mobilize this opinion and direct this opinion in the interest of making the United States a tremendous factor for peace, it will be because we are not big enough for the job.

Interrogation Luncheons

MRS. EDGERTON PARSONS, *Chairman*
MISS ALDA WILSON, *Vice-Chairman*

The object of these Interrogation Luncheons is to stimulate exact thinking about contemporary problems of policy.

Luncheon No. I

What are, or may be, the international implications of civil war?

KATHERYN H. STARBUCK, *Presiding*

MRS. NATHAN BLUMBERG
Chairman, Chicago Branch, W. I. L.
ESTHER CAUKIN BRUNAUER
Research Associate, International Education, A. A. U. W.
MARY GILSON
Economics Dept., University of Chicago
ROBERT MORSS LOVETT
Hull House, Writer, Editor and Teacher
MRS. LAURA PUFFER MORGAN
Foreign Representative, National Council for Prevention of War

It was pointed out that the implications of civil war are reflected clearly in the history of the past and present day but that the translation of those implications into constructive action for World Peace still remains an unsolved problem. International law was thought to be one approach to the question but did not supply the final answer due to the fact that a course of action might be justified by existing law but at the same time an unwise policy for the preservation of peace. The soundest approach to the "cure" of civil war was held to be a cooperative

T O D A Y I N P E A C E A N D W A R

approach in which all nations joined. Regarding the machinery available for this cooperative approach and the procedures necessary for its proper functioning there was a lack of agreement. It was held, however, that the entire question of civil war was complicated at the present time by the fact that we were forced to make decisions in the heat of an existing specific controversy. It was held also that the wisest and soundest decisions must be based on general premises and for those general premises and the machinery to carry them out we must start work now.

LOUISE BACHE, *Recorder*

Luncheon No. II

What do reciprocal trade treaties mean to me and to my neighbor?

MRS ANNE HARTWELL JOHNSTONE, Presiding

C DOUGLAS BOOTH

Traveller, Publisher, Lecturer, Member of Royal Institute of Foreign Affairs

DR HARRY G GIDEONSE

Associate Professor of Economics, University of Chicago

PRESTON SLOSSON

Author, Editor, Professor of History, University of Michigan

MRS A G McGUIRE

Department of Agriculture

Extension of the reciprocal trade program now being debated in Washington was the subject of lively questioning which indicated the "Specificity" (Professor Gidonse's contribution to the English language) of the human approach to the problem of tariffs. Professor Slosson pointed out that the United States could not easily exist without foreign trade, and Mr Booth made the problem of world trade a universal one by stating that other nations could ill afford to be deprived of American products. The fact that agricultural exports were reduced 69 per cent during the depression indicated, according to Mrs McGuire, the stake which agriculture has in the success of the trade program. That equality of treatment—the basis of the unconditional most favored nation clause—was advised by President Washington in his farewell address when he recommended no special trade treatment was pointed out, as was the fact that the present use of equality of treatment was initiated during President Harding's administration, and has been used continuously since that time.

Specific questions indicated the fact that reduction of tariffs cannot be supported by everyone, undue tariff protection must be removed from certain lines of production whose efficiency is not great enough to compete successfully with similar production in other countries for the benefit of lower prices to all consumers. It was agreed, however, that trade agreements must be so negotiated as to provide ample time for a gradual readjustment of economic enterprise within the nation, in order that the individual whose means of livelihood may be undermined by the withdrawal of tariff protection may make the necessary provision for personal economic security.

HELEN SEMMERLING, *Recorder*

Luncheon No. III

What does the stabilization of currency between the great financial powers mean to the citizen of the U. S.?

SARAH S LYON, Presiding

MRS H B COLLOTON

Federated Women's Institutes of Canada

MME. DREFUS-BARNEY

Women's Peace and Disarmament Committee of Geneva

DR ERNEST A. JOHNSON

Professor of Economics, Lake Forest College

DR AURELIA HENRY REINHARDT
President, Mills College

W W WAYMACK

Editor, Des Moines Register & Tribune

The temporary stabilization agreement reached last September by Great Britain, France and the United States was characterized as a step toward better international relations and consequently toward greater security for the average American citizen. While the group recognized that the Agreement was vague, they approved its tendency to restore normal trade conditions and felt that it has recommitted the countries involved to "practical and continuous international cooperation."

MARY PRESSLY, *Recorder*

Luncheon No. IV

How may the success of the Buenos Aires Conference be manifested in the following fields: commerce, diplomacy, cultural relations?

MRS FRED S BENNETT, Presiding

WEDNESDAY EVENING SESSION

Banquet

Presiding, Mrs WILLIAM L HODGKINS

Blessed Are the Peacemakers

By CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

MRS HODGKINS. *Ladies and Gentlemen, it is my very great privilege to welcome you here in behalf of my co-workers. Chicago is, indeed, honored to have the Conference held here, and we hope that the results, interest, and enthusiasm will be so worth while that the Executive Committee will again consider coming to Chicago.*

In thinking of the Cause and Cure of War Conference, I am sure that in the minds of all of us there is one who had vision to start these conferences and the courage and interest to follow this vision. Mrs Catt, may I take this opportunity of expressing to you our deep gratitude for all that you have done, and may I present this audience to you?

LADIES and Gentlemen, we should be full of good cheer tonight. We are ten thousand years nearer to permanent peace than were the cavemen ten thousand years ago. I have been in the last few weeks busy looking over a collection of books on peace and war that has largely been collected since the Cause and Cure of War was organized twelve years ago, and I say to you that I feel quite confident that within the last twenty years or nineteen years since the close of the World War, that the books that have been prepared by the tons are books that are making their policies, their arguments, their conclusive proof that war is bad. I know that somebody must read these books or they wouldn't be printed, and I know that they have their effect in educating the public.

There are three practical, fundamental

MRS PAUL H DOUGLAS

Chairman, Government and Foreign Policies, Cook County League of Women Voters

MRS KENDALL EMERSON

National Chairman, Public Affairs Committee, Y W C A

ARCHIBALD EVANS

International Labor Office

MRS FLORELLE G HAWLEY

Foreign Policy Association

DR FRED RIPPY

Professor of American History, University of Chicago

"Benevolence for once has gone conveniently hand in hand with shrewd Yankee bargaining" might summarize the answer. Endorsement of the results of our Reciprocal Trade Agreements (7 of the 14 negotiated being with Latin America) splendid International Cooperation in the field of public health and growing intercourse between students and professors, gave evidence of more fruitful future relationships than in former self-seeking policies.

MRS O R SELLERS, *Recorder*

weaknesses that I would like to mention for the benefit of those of you who are interested in the peace movement. These weaknesses you may think unimportant. You may even think that they are of no moment at all. To me they are vital. And I feel confident that we shall never have a real victory upon our side of this controversy until these three weaknesses have been transformed into sources of strength. The advantage is that we can make the change ourselves. We do not have to go to any legislative body for advice—we can do it ourselves.

The first of these weaknesses is that we have no nomenclature to define who we are and what we are. We are nameless people who are in the peace movement and are doing what we can to help it along. Many of the organizations cooperating with the Cause and Cure of War have departments that work in the direction of peace—but most of them are called departments of international relations, and many other organizations not in this group also have such departments with that name. What do those words mean?

If you want to speak about a Chicagoan, you take Chicago and you make another word which defines the person who lives there.

Our organizations have failed to find any pungent names. We have a National Peace Conference. But how can you define a member of a peace conference? There is the Emergency Peace Conference. There is the Council for the Prevention of War. We haven't any single organization that has a name for its members, and that is a weakness that you will find is more terrible than you have any idea of now.

A word that could be used is "peacemakers", but the Germans would not accept it because it had been invented by a Jew two thousand years ago, so perhaps that would not be acceptable.

We must find a name for this army of workers for peace. If we started it here, it would go around the world, and we could have power where now we are weak.

The second weakness is that we have no aim. To be sure everybody here would say that she wants peace. Do you not know that peace is not positive? It is the negative of something. What we want is the absence of war—a negation, so we have not any positive statement. There is only one aim for those who want peace—that is the absolute and complete abolition of war. We are not fighting an army, a war department, but an institution, the oldest institution in the world.

The third weakness is that we have no common method—no common policy. I will not go into any details other than to say that that is something we can change. We could come to a common agreement on all of these things.

If we have these three things, do you not see a change in our organization? We should be a much stronger power. Let us have some committees to pick out some nomenclature for us.

Perhaps the reason we have not had a war these last few years is because there are so many people who are thinking about peace. Had you ever thought about that? We never had such sentiment for peace before. There was never anything like it in the world. Perhaps it is this power that has kept the nations from getting into war, and if we can only name ourselves something strong, we can have a great world army that can prevent any wars in the future.

The New International Anarchy

By JAMES T. SHOTWELL

THE PEACE movement in the United States is today confronted with its gravest crisis since the United States rejected the entry into the League of Nations. There is a large and influential movement in the country to bind us to a new covenant, this time with ourselves, which, if adopted, might easily prove disastrous both for the cause of peace and for the country itself.

I refer to the effort to make of neutrality a legally binding system of isolation from all chance of danger of foreign war by a rigid system of prohibitions upon our trade with foreign nations when they are at war. The extreme proposals for this legislation would deny us any liberty of action in time of crisis and its scope is so wide as to cover almost every section of our economic life. I refer to the system of indiscriminate mandatory neutrality legislation.

Let me say at the outset that I am absolutely in accord with the purpose which animates those supporting this legislation. It should hardly be necessary for me to protest to this audience that I share the concern of every peace-loving citizen to keep our country out of war.

But this is no time for wishful thinking. The issues involved are far-reaching. They cover the entire economic life of the country, not only in war-time but in peace as well. And when the country awakens to the full significance of what is now proposed, I fear that there may be a reaction against even the peace movement itself and that the system of prohibitions enacted under the name of neutrality may be swept away like the Eighteenth Amendment and leave us not only politically weakened but morally disunited. If that should occur at a time when a major war actually breaks out, then I fear that all our high purposes and our long and unrelenting endeavor may be swept away in a tidal wave of protest.

It is because this Conference exists for the purpose of examining just such issues as this that I venture to lay before you what I consider to be our own particular crisis at this time. You have made it your especial method to apply the cold light of reason and of scientific analysis to any and every proposition laid before you. This is a case that calls for just such technique.

Let me begin my analysis by looking at the world outside the United States. The chief fact in Europe today, the one that dominates all others, is the rearmament of Germany. In the first place, it dominates German economy to the extent that everything else must yield to this one major industry. The entire foreign trade of the country is made tributary to the securing of raw materials for munitions. In the second place, Germany's neighbors must follow suit and, with Japan arming to the teeth, that means practically all the industrialized nations in the world today. Now the chief fact that the World War laid bare in this regard is that the raw materials for war include almost everything. There is no longer any distinction between contraband and non-contraband in all that comes from farm or mine. Cotton is highly explosive; copper is one of the chief necessities for armaments. Let us, therefore, take these two as symbols of a long list of other staple commodities. A moment's thought will show that any responsible statesman in Europe today, intent upon maintaining security for his country, must make sure of a supply of cotton or copper. This means that he must make sure of these articles now, it is part of the process of preparedness. This means that he must turn to countries from which the supply will be available in time of war, and he must therefore make his arrangements with Brazil, let us say, for cotton, and African Katanga for copper, and in doing so cut off our peace-time market upon which we have to base the prosperity and livelihood of a large

section of our country. This movement is already taking place in anticipation of the threat that lies behind some of the proposals for neutrality legislation today. In view of the distress and poverty in our southern cotton fields today, can you imagine what a protest will rise against such measures as those proposed when the full import of them becomes known? For I have taken only two of a number of important industries which would suffer heavily, if indeed they were not brought to the verge of ruin, if this proposed legislation were enacted. Then, in the hour of reaction, there would be an indiscriminating attack upon the whole peace movement. Surely it is clear that such a policy would defeat its own end.

I am inclined to doubt whether there is any real danger of this extremist legislation being enacted, but it seems to me quite clear that the peace movement in its own interest should definitely dissociate itself from such an extreme proposal.

There is, however, another fallacy in the proposed legislation which seems at present to have a large chance of enactment, and that is the mandatory principle which allows the President the least possible amount of discretion in applying the law. He is to treat both or all belligerents alike. This is based upon the theory that to choose between the belligerents would throw us into the conflict. The theory is also strengthened by a widely held belief that the President cannot be trusted to choose between the aggressor and the victim because his judgment might be misled by propaganda or diplomacy. The problem which this raises is admittedly a very difficult one, but the proposal to cut the Gordian Knot by treating all alike is neither a sure way to avoid involvement nor a method of furthering peace. It would be an open invitation to any militaristic aggressor to proceed with his aggression if he knew that there was no possible chance of the United States aiding the victim in any way whatever. The nation that had full access to raw materials would be strategically strengthened if we had bound ourselves to treat it on the same terms as the weaker nations, while these latter, on their part, would feel all the more helpless when threatened by their neighbor. In short, the proclamation of moral indifference to moral issues throughout the world is an incitation to violence or the threat of it.

As for ourselves, when we would awaken to such consequences of our action, we should undoubtedly call for some revision of the neutrality law at a time when it would be too late, for to revise a neutrality law in time of war would cause us to seem to take part in the conflict itself.

The only workable solution for this problem seems still to be that which the committee of the National Peace Conference proposed a year ago in the suggested re-draft of the neutrality act. We inserted in it an escape clause which reads:

If the President shall find that one or more of the belligerent countries was attacked in contravention of the provisions of the Pact of Paris, and if such finding is concurred in by a majority of the other non-belligerent countries to said Pact, he shall so advise the Congress, and, with its consent, he may revoke his embargo proclamations issued under this Act in respect to such country or countries so attacked and the provisions hereof shall thereupon cease to apply in respect to such country or countries.

This still seems to me a necessary measure of safety for ourselves as well as for the furtherance of peace throughout the world.

There Is No Discharge in the War

By BISHOP G. BROMLEY OXNAM

KIPLING'S poignant line, "There's no discharge in the war," applies to the citizens of the world as well as to the British marching in heavy boots. The War God Mars stands in the wings of the European stage awaiting his cue. The villain of the world drama is likely to occupy center stage at any moment.

If Europe enters another war, it will in all probability be a long war. It will begin as a conflict between nations. These nations may be thought of as vertical sections. In each nation, or vertical section, we find the rich, the middle class and the poor. This vertical section is fighting another vertical section, or nation, with its rich, middle class and poor. As the war goes on there is grave danger of the masses finding more in common with the poor across the battle line than with the classes above them in the nation. Loyalties may leap across national boundary lines. If this occurs, the conflict will change in alignment. It will cease to be vertical and will be horizontal, that is, the masses of Europe will be fighting the classes of Europe without regard to nationality. This will be a class-war upon a continental scale. It will mean dictatorship on each side.

Is there no discharge in the war? Not until economists, educators, executives and engineers pool their intelligence to solve the economic problem that lies at the root of present warfare. There must be full access to economic opportunities guaranteed the individual and equal access to world raw materials guaranteed the nations where terrific pressure of population on food supply is found. Laski is right in insisting that certain problems must be solved by present society if there is to be discharge from the war. These problems are: (1) It has to solve the contradiction between its power to produce and its inability to distribute in a rational or morally adequate way; (2) It has to remove the barriers which economic nationalism places in the way of an unimpeded world market; (3) It has to remove the fear of insecurity by which the worker's life is haunted; (4) It has

to end the folly of international competition in wage-rates and hours of labor. It has to save western standards from the slave-labor of the East; (5) It has to cut away the jungle growth of vested interest which at present so seriously impairs its efficiency; (6) It has to find some way of removing from the clash of competing imperialisms those structures of armed power which, clothed in the garb of national sovereignty, makes certain the perpetual threat of insecurity and, born of it, the advent of war.

A second essential is demanded, however, if there is to be discharge from war. World law and order must supplant international anarchy. That involves world government with a consequent sacrifice of sufficient national sovereignty to guarantee to the world government the sov-

ereignty that is essential to world peace.

There is a third essential, and it has to do with the human heart. It is possible that education and religion may offer solution here. The heart and mind must be so changed that selfishness is eradicated and the desire to serve becomes regnant. The individual must be so trained that he thinks in terms of the group and dedicates his talents to the high task of enriching personality for all. The changed heart and mind upon which religion insists, and which can be achieved by education and religion are necessary.

Modern Canutes who would hold back the tide of social change fail to realize the rising tide springs from the fundamental yearning of men for abundant living. If such persons refuse to be educated by ideas they may be educated by events.

THURSDAY MORNING SESSION

Presiding, SARAH S. LYON

What Changes in American Legislation Would Contribute Toward Preventing War, Shortening Its Duration, and Localizing It?

By QUINCY WRIGHT

THERE are two diverse ways of approach to the problem of preventing war. One theory is that war can be prevented by isolation, the other, that different states can be organized politically into one body. These two methods are held in the minds of people today.

The prevention of war seems to call for political organization to make it possible to preserve peace between states that are inevitably bound closely together. We have had peace as a result of expanding larger political units. The danger of external wars has oftentimes been the cause of internal peace. The problem of preventing war, therefore, in the world, is by organizing the world as a whole. We need methods of political education different from those available to create a state. Some say that if you organize the world to prevent war, small wars will spread, developing into a world war.

There are dangers, however, in a policy of localization of war. 1) There is likely to be an unrealistic view—wishful thinking only. It has been the European experience that nearly all wars that developed with a great Power on one side spread to all the other great Powers. Of fourteen European wars only three have remained localized. This is the balance of power principle at work—the great powers acting in their own interests. 2) Localization of war always favors the aggressor, for example, in the Italo-Ethiopian war, Mussolini knew that if he could keep that war from spreading to the great Powers he would be able to take over the small state. If a Power can,

by the use of war, expand, it will do so. The greatest physical obstacle has been the great Power coming to the defence of the smaller state on whom war is declared. The localization of a war stimulates injustice.

In regard to shortening the duration of a war there is harmony between the policy of stopping a war early and the policy of localizing it. Another way is to organize the world against the aggressor, as for example, Great Britain encouraging the use of sanctions imposed on Italy.

How should the present neutrality law be amended in the United States?

The neutrality law comes to an end on May 1, and unless a new law is passed or the old re-enacted we will go back to the law of 1794.

There are three schools of American opinion as to how this neutrality legislation should be amended, and what policies should be adopted:

- 1) Mandatory neutrality group. The opinion that we should extend the embargo to all war materials.
- 2) The wish to return to the old "Freedom-of-Sea" Doctrine.
- 3) The cooperationists. This school favors legislation in collaboration with other countries.

I believe in general that we should move in the direction of cooperation to suppress the aggressor. Our policy of neutrality should be based on the Pact of Paris and the Argentine Anti-War Treaty to both of which we are parties.

The first condemns war and the second condemns wars of aggression. In addition, by the latter, the United States has "undertaken to make every effort for the maintenance of peace" and to adopt "a common and solidary attitude" with other neutrals. These treaties imply consultation with other parties in time of grave international emergency, to explore all possible means to prevent war or, if that proves impossible, to stop it.

To make such consultation effective the parties should, as soon as the consultation is summoned, stop all trade in arms, munitions, and war materials and the making of loans to both litigating states. If the conciliatory efforts fail and hostilities begin, consulting states should at once propose an armistice. If both accept the armistice hostilities stop. If neither accepts it both are aggressors and the embargoes continue. If one accepts it and the other does not, which, according to experience, would usually be the case, the latter is the aggressor. The consulting states should then raise the embargoes in behalf of the state which accepts the armistice.

To implement such a policy, I believe that our present neutrality act should be amended: (1) by adding war materials to the list which may be embargoed, (2) by authorizing the President to participate with other states in a policy of imposing embargoes whenever a consultation is summoned under the treaties to prevent war, (3) by authorizing the President after consultation with other neutrals to raise the embargoes in behalf of the victim of aggression, (4) in addition, to forbid Americans from traveling in war zones and in belligerent ships.

The government should be free to insist on the right to trade with the victim of aggression and with neutral states which become involved with the aggressor through the application of sanctions. A mandatory policy oblivious of the contingencies of a particular war will certainly fail. The President must have sufficient discretion to adjust details of policy in accordance with the action of other states and the circumstances of a particular war, always within the general principles of the treaties here referred to.

This policy would contribute to preventing war, keeping out of war, and to supporting the peace treaties to which we are committed. Furthermore, it would avoid the depressing effects illustrated by Jefferson's embargo of 1807 which would follow a mandatory general embargo in a war involving the important commercial nations.

A PANEL CONSISTING OF MRS CLIFTON UTLEY, MRS JACOB VINER, MISS MARGARET CHANDLER, AND MR WRIGHT

Mrs Viner. Should this new policy really be called "neutrality legislation"?

Mr Wright. If we mean by "neutrality" a policy to keep the country out of war, it is all right. The additional conception of neutrality is to include all the body of law dealing with contraband, blockade, along with obligations. Another meaning of neutrality is the policy of complete impartiality. But the question is, whether we can distinguish between the belligerents.

Mrs Utley. Would you explain what is meant by "mandatory legislation" and "discretionary legislation"?

Mr Wright. The distinction between these two terms is very much abused. Mandatory legislation means legislation which prescribes policies in such detail that the President has no discretion in applying it to particular circumstances. Discretionary or permissive legislation lays down a general policy, and gives the President certain powers, to exercise in given contingencies in order to carry on the general policy laid down.

Mrs Utley. Are discretionary embargoes compatible with our treaty obligations?

Mr Wright. Yes. A neutral must be formally impartial, however, formal neutrality usually favors one side and is not always real impartiality. It is doubtful whether or not in international law a country has formal obligations because of the influence that treaties have on international law. For example, the Pact of Paris has denounced war, and if a state has violated this treaty there is no obligation on the part of other states to treat it as a neutral. They are entitled to discriminate as they see fit.

Miss Chandler. What is meant by the "cash and carry" policy?

Mr Wright. This policy may have many good merits. In theory, trade is carried on with belligerents at no risk to American trade. The goods must be paid for by the belligerents and they must come and get it with their own ships. The term "cash" does not literally mean cash for the goods. If an American merchant wants to give credit to a belligerent, it is impossible for the government to prevent him. But the title to the goods must be transferred to the belligerent before the ship leaves American territory, and no subsequent protection will be given by the United States.

Mrs Viner. Is this really an impartial policy—"cash and carry"?

Mr Wright. No. If we have a policy of mandatory embargo, enemies can prevent a less strong naval power from trading with us, yet with discretionary legislation we could prevent stronger powers from trading with us, if we so wished.

Mrs Utley. What is a war material?

Mr Wright. One way to define a war material is to adopt the belligerent's own

contraband list—those materials which the belligerent will seize on high seas if destined for the enemy. In modern conditions of war this means textiles, food stuffs, metals, rubber—almost every material.

Mrs Utley. What about credits and loans during a war? Is it possible to prevent lending to a neutral who in turn lends to a belligerent?

Mr Wright. It is an impossible policy to enforce, that is, preventing a neutral from lending to a neutral, who in turn lends to a belligerent. I suggest that you read *Boycotts Against War* by Evans Clark (Twentieth Century Fund) for a discussion on this point.

Miss Chandler. Would a mandatory policy seriously interfere with sanctions?

Mr Wright. Such a policy would not interfere with sanctions if a war is a localized one. But if we have a war extending to most of the great powers a mandatory policy would be greatly to the advantage of the aggressor. Other states enforcing sanctions against the aggressor would be unable to get supplies from a neutral.

Mrs Viner. Will you clear up the difference between war loans and war debts?

Mr Wright. There are three kinds of credit possible in war time.

1. War debts, so-called because they are intergovernmental credits made between governments that are not neutral. These credits are not involved in the question of neutrality—they are only made if involved in war.
2. Public loans floated in the market through a private banking house.
3. Commercial credits—a private firm selling to a belligerent and giving commercial credit. This is exceedingly difficult to prevent by any legislation.

Mrs Utley. What provision should be made for armed merchantmen coming to a neutral country for war materials?

Mr Wright. I believe that the belligerent should be prohibited from sending armed merchantmen as well as submarines. They are likely to bring war nearer to the shores of the neutral.

Mrs Utley. Will you comment on the Latin-American exceptions in the present neutrality legislation?

Mr Wright. This legislation does not apply to an American country unless it is cooperating with a European country. I hope it can be changed.

Mrs Viner. Is there some danger that if we pass neutrality legislation that the public will consider that it has done enough to prevent war?

Mr Wright. The major problem of keeping out of war is to organize the world to prevent war. Neutrality legislation is likely to be misleading, because it seems to indicate that passing legislation rules us out of war. We must take a realistic view.

The Interest of Business in the Issue of War and Peace

By WILL R. MANIER, JR

MONEY is more and more at the root of world economic problems. People are too prone to confuse money with wealth. Money is not wealth and the failure to recognize that fact is responsible for economic maladjustments today. My great grandfather when asked what he was worth might have said, so many farms, so many slaves, so much stock. Wealth used to be considered as tangible assets. Now wealth is kept in strong boxes. Money is only a token for wealth, a claim on wealth, a standard of value, a medium of exchange.

In our industrial civilization we have heard much talk of overproduction of wealth in this country and have seen the spectacle of wheat destroyed, cotton burned. Yet people were starving in other countries. It was not overproduction; it was merely that the medium of exchange was not doing its duty, was not permitting people to buy the commodities they needed. I have no solution to the problem, but somewhere, somehow, somebody is going to discover how to make money serve its socially valuable function.

Our business procedures have been founded on the idea of making a profit in money, which is not real wealth, and they have not been successful. It is a mistake to think of business men as a composite group. They are all distinct individuals. It has been said that business men could stop war. Yes, they could, if they all thought alike. So could women stop war, if they were all alike. But they are not alike and they don't think en masse.

We are all caught in the backwash of war and one of the effects has been to make men fall back on authority. In church groups they fall back on fundamentalism; in government they fall back on dictators. The only safeguard of democratic principles is to develop through education of people a sense of private judgment and individual responsibility. Another effect has been to crowd out people of liberal opinion. This has been seen evidenced in the Spanish civil war. The extremists of both sides took charge. The problem is to steer between the two extremes by the old-time processes of democracy.

An important part of the program of Rotary International is to promote international cooperation, good will and peace. Rotary International has a membership of 180,000 men in eighty-two countries of the world. Its members are successful, practical business men, each club being made up of one representative of each business and profession in the community. In all my travels about the world,

speaking to the Rotary clubs, I have never found a business man who wanted war under any conditions, or one who would admit that war would do his business any good. But I never found one who did not feel that in spite of everything war will come again. Too often in working for peace we overlook this psychological factor in war. There are no real pacifists, psychologically or emotionally. When war actually starts, when the bands play and the soldiers march and the war propaganda gets under way we are all likely to be swept into it, get caught into mass psychology. In my own memories of war, horrible as many of them are—the filth, the vermin, the discomfort, the tragedy—I can still recall the great feeling of unselfish solidarity that the war brought, the unifying sense of sacrifice, of courage. The real problem is to mobilize the spirit of unselfish sacrifice for peace as we do for war.

International Rotary joins with the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War in its desire to promote international understanding, good will and peace and to do it intelligently.

In view of the fact that one of our speakers yesterday morning spoke of the interest of Rotary International in the advancement of international understanding goodwill and peace, it may be of interest to our members to know some of the plans which Rotary International has for implementing this object of Rotary.

In the secretariat in Chicago, Rotary International has a section which is undertaking to promote institutes of international affairs in various communities of the United States and Canada. This section interests the local Rotary club in calling together interested groups in a community and establishing an institute of international affairs. These institutes are sometimes held for several days consecutively, sometimes consist of a series of monthly or weekly lectures and sometimes of lectures on international subjects to schools.

Rotary International would appreciate the cooperation of the member organizations of the conference on the Cause and Cure of War in its efforts to promote these institutes in their respective communities. Address inquiries to Rotary International, 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Discussion Groups on Methods of Work

Group I.—Demonstration of One Type of Community Meeting — Mrs. Oscar Marx.

Pretending this was a session of an Institute on Peace, the audience proposed various means of pooling the efforts of all organizations in community for peace. Mrs. Marx's test was Mary Beard's "Thinking without action is futile—action without thinking is fatal."

"War must be abolished," Mrs. Marx continued, "because omitting moral and sentimental reasons, this is an age of reason and reason tells us war is inexpedient, futile, wasteful, politically unsound and illegal. We can oppose war through

- (1) Education, to create public opinion;
- (2) Legislation, for government operation under a peace and not a war system;
- (3) Cooperation, through unified effort to establish permanent and universal peace. We must educate those who actively want peace, merely accept peace, are indifferent to or oppose peace.

Suggestions from Mrs. Marx and the floor included: Peace slogans and dramatic use of special days such as Armistice Day; provide clippings from recognized periodicals and newspapers for use on school bulletin boards, cooperate with international relations clubs in schools; sponsor contests for essays, drawings, cartoon scrap-books, etc.; do not ignore submerged groups (colored, foreign) whose votes may undo good work; do congressmen a favor by informing them what legislation affecting peace is com-

ing up and tell them how you feel personally, help elect peace men to all offices, from local peace councils, express objections to pro-war films, learn your own national organization's program, base an institute on world trade and get shops to have exhibits, demonstrate marathons at state conferences, use Francis Lederer's offer to speak for peace and show films, returning Conference delegates should make joint appearances in as many public gatherings as possible to show united front for peace of women's organizations; assign each national organization member a definite task to perform for the Cause and Cure of War.

Mrs. C. S. DEMAREE

Group II.—The Defining Bee — Mrs. Edgerton Parsons.

The Defining Bee was divided into two parts. First, a list of fifty words used frequently in the discussion of current events was presented one by one not to define but to secure the mental reaction of the audience. Later, the dictionary definition of each word was presented and the transition in meaning noted, eliciting a lively discussion. Second, a list of names of twenty-five countries was presented and the audience asked to give descriptive adjectives which applied in 1907 and again in 1937. This tested the knowledge of history and emotional reaction. There was a wide divergence of opinion which reflected the personal

interests and opinions of the members of the audience

Group III.—Youth Education for Peace —Miss Nelle Bowman.

To bring about an effective, intelligent public opinion on the problems of war and peace, a dynamic education is essential. Since democracy works through public opinion, the more intelligent and sane this opinion can be, the sooner we may expect a stable machinery for the preservation of peace.

The education of youth is a cooperative enterprise. All the agencies entering into it must work together. No formal schooling can bring about our ends unless the adult world, which controls the environment of the child, joins forces with the school. This means that the press, radio, home, church, libraries and other social groups must unite in a common endeavor.

Educators might adopt some of the methods of the war experts for their own purposes. School courses need to be remade in terms of social sensitivity. They need colorful reading materials, pictures and stories which present facts accurately but in a dramatic and pictorial form that will attract a wide reading public. Formal courses in international relations are not enough. Extra curricular activities are essential, in order to give a realistic experience. They must be geared into the regular program of studies and thus be an outgrowth of formal instruction.

Teachers must have training and vision but they must also have security. They must be supported by the public opinion of the community. In too many communities teachers have felt their security imperiled, if they dared to discuss controversial questions.

Textbooks are often poor, but at their best are not enough. There is a wealth of inexpensive materials available which should be used to supplement the text.

Modern psychology shows that we must begin in the earliest grades to build behavior patterns. The process must be continuous and the school training must be supplemented by an adult education program. A national survey (1934) on the teaching of international relations in the secondary schools of the United States showed a woeful lack of definite instruction. The crowded room and the evident desire for discussion at the close of the paper showed the keen interest of the group in this subject. Mrs. Bradford of Wisconsin summed up the sentiment by suggesting that each person go home resolved to discover what is being done in the schools of her own town and to use her influence to promote peace education.

Group IV.—Opportunity of Drama Toward Peace Work—Mrs. Albert A. Drier.

The supreme drama of war accounts for its curious fascination for humanity. It is

action and emotion at the highest pitch, even though it be the Drama of Death.

There has never been a time when conditions were more favorable for effective work along dramatic lines and there is no better way of showing causes and effects. This is our opportunity to guide and control thought.

The amateur stage can act as an antidote to the slow poison of war propaganda found in much of the amusement world. We must work actively for peace and above all we must make it attractive—talk it, live it, advertise it.

If war is to be made tolerable, the romantic tradition must be carried on. It is the false conception of heroism that we must ridicule out of existence by dramatizing it in its true light.

A play may be of service to a social idea in one of three quite separate ways—presenting new aspects of a subject, seeking to convince, or acting to intensify the enthusiasm of those already convinced. Be sure that the play chosen is worthy of your organization and of the cause of peace. Nothing discredits a plan or organization so quickly as inferior material.

One good peace play, one good dramatic reading or review, and one good speech on the peace theme each year will be a dramatic Triple Alliance that may accomplish a great deal.

Learn to dramatize news items suitable for peace work and thus heighten their appeal.

There is no security in peace organizations alone, for public opinion may change overnight and be nothing short of war hysteria. The person who would work effectively for peace must be ready on every occasion to puncture the bubble of enjoyment of hysteria.

We dare not trust those who make the purveying of amusements a business. We must make it our business too.

One of the uses of speech is to disguise motive. Mere words have turned a disarmament conference into its direct opposite, a conference for the measurement and allotment of arms. By their words they want peace, by their deeds, sovereignty. They cannot have both. Clemenceau confessed that the art of arranging how men are to live is more complex than that of massacring them.

But the incurable optimism of the American woman says it can be done.

Group V.—Peace Work with Farm Women—Mrs. Ellsworth Richardson.

As early as 1847 farmers asked the government to establish a Department of Agriculture and State Colleges of Agriculture. These were secured in 1867 and have developed into the present system of county agent service in all counties in the United States, and home demonstration service in most of the counties. This affords a system of adult education to which farmers must subscribe initial support in member-

ship and finance. This program reaches into all interests of farm and farm family life. This organization provides the machinery for activity.

The discussion opened with a statement by the chairman relative to farmers' interest in World Peace.

Farmers are organized in every state in the Union. The organization of farmers has evolved from neighborly group interest in Colonial days for the purpose of learning from each other better methods of farming—to organized groups today in every state and county of the nation.

Security, including economic, educational, social and inspirational interests, stands out as a prime reason for this development of organization in many fields. Foremost in these activities is the interest in the economic and social aspects of farm life and has led farmers into a definite study of world relationship.

We believe our farm problem to be definitely related to the problems of the world and involves the question of World Peace.

The discussion then led into methods on procedure in states, relative to the Peace Work.

Mrs. Colloton, from Canada, stated that peace study is carried on through women's institutes with government help, and reaches down to individual farm homes.

Mrs. Morrow and Mrs. Griffith, from Wyoming, outlined the Marathon Study Work among farm women, who are in the majority in this State and are assuming leadership in this work. The G. F. W. C. are cooperating with them. Nancy Babbo outlined work in Pennsylvania with school children in Peace Poster contests. Mrs. Wilcox, of Minnesota, told about the demonstration of World Peace at the State Fair in which rural and urban women participated.

Report was made of work being done in Illinois by the Church Council for Rural Adults and Young People, in Peace Work. Keen interest in sources of material for study of World Peace was shown. The Department of Agriculture, Cause and Cure of War, National Council for Prevention of War, Foreign Policy Association, National Peace Conference, and other groups were listed as sources.

The opinion of the group was that women can best aid in peace work by promoting education toward this end.

MRS. ELLSWORTH RICHARDSON, *Chairman*
MRS. HARRY TERRELL, *Secretary*

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEETS

Information on and extra copies of the Delegate's Worksheet may be secured by writing to the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War Headquarters, 1622 Grand Central Terminal Building, New York City.

The Demonstration Marathon Round Table in the Thursday afternoon session will be printed in the last DELEGATE WORKSHEET.

Why We Value Membership in the National Conference

Excerpts from Statements During Roll Call of National Presidents of Member Organizations.

American Association of University Women

Represented by: MRS. H. K. PAINTER, *Speaking for Dr. Meta Glass, President*

Because As members of an international organization trying to accomplish international understanding, based on educational processes of understanding of other nations, we welcome the opportunity to cooperate with other groups in developing public opinion. There is one objective that we have in common—that of building for peace.

Council of Women for Home Missions

Represented by: MRS. J. T. TROWBRIDGE, *Vice-President*

Because Our organization, composed of twenty-three denominations, issues bulletins which carry information down to millions of women, it is necessary for us to have some group conferences such as this one, which will be a clearing house for inspiration and information.

Committee on Women's Work of the Foreign Missions Conference

Represented by: MISS SARAH S. LYON, *Chairman*

Because Our very name suggests that while we are members of the Conference, we are *foreign* missions. Our aim to help to build hoped-for world community is definitely aided by our association with the National Conference. To no group does the cause of abolishing war and building a peaceful world community based on peace and understanding come closer.

General Federation of Women's Clubs

Represented by: MISS ALVES LONG, *Chairman of International Relations*

Because:

- 1 It broadens our horizons to hear issues of the day discussed by authoritative speakers and questions asked by authoritative delegates.
- 2 We value the change of emphasis from opinion to knowledge, based upon fact-finding.
- 3 The change from the debate, trying to prove an argument, to forums trying to arrive at the truth.
- 4 The Marathon Round Tables round up sentiment in our communities, teach the value of discussion and also become examples for local programs and new technique in presentations seeking to separate thought from emotion.

National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations

Represented by: MRS. AUSTIN L. KIMBALL, *National President*

Because: This association helped to create the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, and that which we help to

create becomes doubly dear to us. The Conference program gears in with the public affairs and adult education program of the association. It often happens that the Y. W. C. A. building in some communities is the only building open at all times for the use of peace organizations such as the local Cause and Cure of War and Peace Councils. We further cooperate by using informal group-work technique both in adult and youth groups, thus taking the program to the people.

National Council of Jewish Women

Represented by: MRS. ARTHUR BRIN, *President*

Because

- 1 We realize the importance of having in this country a group that will bring together as nearly as possible the opinion of the women of America.
- 2 The solidarity of our work is of great importance.
- 3 No single organization can be as strong in its own community as all of us together.
- 4 No single organization can be as forceful in speaking to our government as all of us together.
- 5 No single organization can be as important in offering its cooperation in the international scheme as all of us together, through education, cooperation and legislative action.

National Federation of Business and Professional Women

Represented by: MISS KATHRYN E. STARBUCK, *Chairman of International Relations*

Because. We know that peace is essential to the welfare of the business women and we realize that it requires the united efforts of all women to develop a public opinion that will help to insure peace. Today our membership of over 61,000 women located in 1,500 communities in the United States is more interested than ever before in the findings of conferences such as this. We look to the Committee on the Cause and Cure of War as a source of study material. Its Marathon Round Tables are becoming increasingly popular in the clubs of the federation.

National League of Women Voters

Represented by: MRS. WILLIAM G. HIBBARD, *Finance Chairman*

Because Today, the League of Women Voters has a program in the field of foreign policy geared more directly to legislative action in Washington than has perhaps any other organization represented in this Conference. Our present active support in the Congress of the extension of the reciprocal trade program and discretionary neutrality legislation is indicative of the positive action which we—without meaning to be self-righteous—think the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War is designed to

promote. It is our earnest hope that member organizations will be so stimulated by this Twelfth Conference that they will realize increasingly the necessity of vigorously supporting specific governmental steps to strengthen American foreign policy.

National Women's Christian Temperance Union

Represented by: MRS. IDA B. WISE SMITH, *National President*

Because In the W. C. T. U., a world organization, organized in 52 countries, peace is of major importance to our group. From the twenty departments of work of the National W. C. T. U. there was set up, two years ago, a Five-Point Five Year Program. Naturally peace was made one of the five points. In arranging our program of study and action for the 10,000 local groups in the United States, the program of the Conference has been made the basis. In this Twelfth Conference, I have been impressed anew with the sanity of the program and its acceptability. Hence I pledge for the National W. C. T. U. in the coming year a greater devotion and a more effective service in the study and service of the "cause and cure of war."

National Women's Conference of American Ethical Union

Represented by: MRS. OSCAR B. QUINTO, *Acting President*

Because Our membership in the Committee on the Cause and Cure of War does not commit us to any discussion as a group, but does give opportunity for the individual to pursue whatever course she feels is best. This, too, is in line with the policy of the Ethical Society. Its members have every opportunity to "take sides" so to speak, but the society as such remains neutral. We value our membership since it makes it possible to distribute study matter and to disseminate information gained from speakers who have authentic information. We feel this is the intelligent and safe way to educate humanity to strive for peace of a lasting nature. We feel this course of education has only just begun and there is much to be gained by continuing along these lines.

National Women's Trade Union League

Represented by: MISS AGNES NESTOR, *Member of the Executive Board*

Because

1. We have a large affiliated membership of women trade unionists, as well as allied membership.
2. While the Conference brings to us many broad points of view, we bring, perhaps, another and new point of view to this group.
3. Our organization has problems on the economic side that are perhaps different from what the other organizations have to meet.
4. It helps us to formulate a program of study.

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEET

TWELFTH CONFERENCE ON THE CAUSE AND CURE OF WAR, PALMER HOUSE,
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, JANUARY 26 TO JANUARY 29 (INCLUSIVE), 1937

10c per copy; 4 copies mailed, 50c

NO. 4

THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Presiding, MRS. IDA B. WISE SMITH

Demonstration Marathon Round Table

Leader, MRS. FREDERIC BEGGS, Assisted by ELIZABETH FACKT

SUBJECT. The Good Neighbor Policy, How Shall It Be Expressed in the Pacific Area?

QUESTION FOR DISCUSSION: How can the United States act together with other nations (1) to keep the peace in the Orient (2) to prevent China from being further partitioned or conquered piece-meal (3) to insure observance of treaties (4) to protect the Philippines?

The purpose of the Round Table is to demonstrate a method of discussion leading to group agreement and decision as to group action. Is it not to be thought of as a dramatization of a meeting of the Department of State, but rather, as a meeting of friends and acquaintances who have been coming together as a Marathon Round Table over a period of several years and who are now trying to think in terms of the solution of definite problems which might easily face our country. Each one is supposing himself to be a member of the State Department, responsible for correct information regarding our foreign relations in a definite region of the world or in a definite field of interest. Therefore his contribution will be in the form of advice on the question under discussion from the point of view, as he supposes it might be, of an expert in the State Department.

Members of the Round Table and the assignments they accepted:

Leader and Secretary of State—MRS. FREDERIC BEGGS

Under Secretary of State—ALVES LONG

Chief of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs—DAVID POSTON

Chief of the Division of Western European Affairs—ELIZABETH FACKT

Chief of the Division of Latin-American Affairs—LOUISE WARREN JOHNSON

Chief of the Division of Relations with the Philippine Commonwealth—MRS. EDGERTON PARSONS

Chief of the Division of Trade Agreements—MRS. LEON H. FRADKIN

Chief of the Division of Current Information—KATE MILLER

Historical Adviser—DR. ESTHER CAUKIN BRUNAUER

Economic Adviser—ALLEN B. COLE
Geographer—DORIS DRAPER

Assistant to the Secretary—MRS. GWINNE, DENNIS McEVoy

The Round Table presented a condensation of the work of several meetings. Although it was not the purpose of the Round Table to educate the audience in matters of state, there were three important points demonstrated:

- 1 The impossibility of isolating any major problem of state—economically, politically, or geographically, and therefore the obvious need for world cooperation
- 2 The impossibility of pursuing any given course of action, no matter how necessary, unless it enjoys popular support
- 3 The vital importance of organized and vocal public opinion in support of peace policies

The chairman after stating the purpose of the round table said. Suppose that Japan requested the United States to discuss the further non-fortification of the Islands of the Pacific. The United States wishes to discuss it not unilaterally but multilaterally. That would seem to put the problem up to the United States to initiate some discussion with all nations interested in the Pacific. The question to be faced is to find a course of action for the United States to pursue, that might tend to decrease tensions.

The *Far Eastern Expert* presented the problem in all its phases and some of the treaty history of the Far East, stressing that Japan has come of age. The *Economic Adviser* indicated the economic conflict between the United States and Japan because of the new industrialization of a Japan come-of-age. This self-sufficiency on the part of Japan is really a threat to American agricultural interests. The *Historical Adviser* pointed out the history of our relations with Japan saying that Japan's being called a menace—an idea thirty years old—was brought on largely by American foreign policy and the agitation in this country over Japanese immigration.

The *Western European Affairs Expert* mentioned a new factor in foreign affairs, the German-Japanese Pact, the old system of balance of power set up in the Far East. The Pact signed on November 25, 1936, provides primarily for the cooperation of Japan and Germany in defense of diverse activities of the Communist Internationale.

This expert submitted three questions to be considered:

1. How are we going to maintain an Open Door Policy?
2. How avoid becoming mixed up in European affairs?
3. What about our relations with the Philippine Islands?

After a spirited discussion with historical and political facts supplied by the experts, the *Secretary of State* asked the *Far Eastern Expert* for a recommendation. He said:

"Deflations of militarization in Japan should be the keynote of American foreign policy by every means possible—that removal of objectionable clauses in immigration should be brought about as soon as such a move might receive public support—but this being in the future we should now explore the possibilities of:

- 1 Calling a joint conference of signatories of the Nine Power Pact (possibly of all nations interested economically in the Pacific) to consider economic problems—possibly joint economic cooperation with China to reconstruct and stabilize China.
- 2 Based upon the success of this conference—working toward a plan for collective responsibility for peace.
- 3 Considering reciprocal trade and treaty agreements.

The *Secretary of State* accepted the recommendation and asked that a complete memorandum be prepared and be circulated for careful study before another meeting. The group reverted then to the Marathon.

The *Leader*—Suggestions and agreements as to community education campaign:

1. To develop a community forum with large mass meetings to be held on alternate weeks dealing with the subjects which we have had under discussion.

- 2 To organize small neighborhood discussion groups to meet in the intervening weeks—the members of which would clarify their thinking and return to the larger meeting—again putting their ideas together in the effort to find a common ground.

- 3 To train leaders for these small discussion groups through a leadership institute.

- 4 To secure the cooperation of all branch libraries.

- 5 To organize beginners' Marathons.

TODAY IN PEACE AND WAR

THURSDAY EVENING SESSION

Presiding, MRS. WILLIAM G. HIBBARD

The Far East

By CARROLL BINDER

MANY remarkable changes—some of them tending to ease tensions and some of them accelerating the drift toward war—have taken place in the Far East in the last two years. One of the most remarkable developments in the Far East is the new spirit of China. Until recently China seemed to accept Japanese aggression with little but resignation. It endeavored to interest the United States, Great Britain, the League of Nations and other western instruments in its cause. Some elements, notably the students, demanded a more vigorous resistance to Japan but most Chinese leaders were content to leave the defense of Chinese political and economic independence to western friends, to negotiations with the aggressor and to time which had served China so well in the past.

Today all that is changed and no one is more astounded and discomfited than the Japanese military who had been having things pretty much their own way ever since the Manchurian incident in the autumn of 1931. Under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek, China has developed a formidable national army and a spirit of militant nationalism. Believing that time is on their side the nationalist leaders are doing their best to delay a head-on collision with Japan. Each month of delay, they believe, will permit them to offer a correspondingly more vigorous military resistance. Few Chinese privately believe their armies are strong enough to defeat the better equipped, longer-trained Japanese forces. They believe, however, that only a readiness to fight will enable them to come to terms with Japanese imperialism which will permit China to survive as an independent state.

This new attitude on the part of China has produced significant reactions within Japan where the aggression by the Japanese army has never commanded the support of certain business and liberal elements. Another sobering influence upon Japanese militarism has been the creation of a powerful and practically autonomous military establishment in its far-eastern provinces by Soviet Russia. Russia displays no aggressive designs and could not afford to do so, were it thus inclined, on account of its position in Europe. But the completion of an important military railway and the development of a large land, air and sea force in the Far East acts as a discourager of Japanese aggression—one of the great threats to the peace of the Far East.

Two other significant developments in that sphere are the expiration on December 31 of the naval limitation treaties regulating not only the size of the military establishments of the United States, Japan and

Great Britain, but also the fortifications of strategically situated areas and the attenuation of American ties with the Philippines.

It is a great loss to peace that the system of naval limitation so laboriously evolved at the end of the World War should have been scrapped at the instance of Japan. A naval race is now on and it is improbable that Japan will emerge from that race with the same degree of national security guaranteed by the dead treaties. The western nations are in better position to build huge navies than the relatively poorer Japanese and under existing conditions they are certain to do so. Meantime the taxpayers of all naval powers will suffer and the cause of peace will not progress.

The Far Eastern policy of the United States leaves much to be desired in its present form. We have retained responsibility without authority in the Philippines—a condition bad for everybody and a possible path to conflict. We seem, temporarily at least, to be indifferent to our historic policies regarding Chinese political and territorial integrity, the open door and other issues. But have we definitely abandoned them? While our position in these respects remains in doubt we are inviting trouble with ambitious Far Eastern powers who may be tempted to flaunt American interests there on the assumption that they no longer matter only to discover there are certain things for which we are still determined to fight. Citizens concerned for the peace should endeavor to clarify our policies in the Pacific so that there will be no misunderstandings provocative of war. Our Philippine policy, for example, should be determined from the standpoint of long-term national well-being rather than by lobbies of special interests such as the domestic sugar and dairy interests.

Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace

By CHARLES G. FENWICK

THE Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace is certain to mark significant progress forward in the development of the foreign policy of the United States. History will judge it not merely by the treaties and resolutions which were adopted but by the spirit of goodwill and cooperation which prevailed from beginning to end. Throughout the proceedings the figure of Secretary Hull towered high above controversial issues, and his integrity and high idealism were taken up by other

delegates and written into the treaties which were finally adopted.

The most significant accomplishment of the Conference was the treaty by which the principles of the Monroe Doctrine were extended to all of the American Republics. Without using the words of the Monroe Doctrine the treaty that was adopted pledged each and all of them to consult in the event of any threat to the peace of America. The Monroe Doctrine is still ours to enforce in time of need but no longer is it regarded by the Latin American Republics as a veiled threat to their security. It is now their responsibility as well as ours.

Next in importance was the treaty presented by the United States with the object of coordinating the existing peace treaties and providing for a common neutrality policy. In the end all of the American Republics became sponsors of our treaty to the extent of supporting those of its provisions looking to the strengthening of the machinery of peace. The United States was, however, forced to abandon its attempt to have the provisions of its own neutrality legislation made the rule of the continent. A number of states simply refused to accept the provisions that both belligerents were to be treated alike irrespective of the fact that one might be an aggressor and the other an innocent victim of aggression. The general feeling was that some distinction must be made between states which live up to their obligations and others which may be tempted to break them.

The conference points the way to the extension to the rest of the world of the principle of consultation embodied in the treaty presented by the United States. In the face of the grave menace to peace of the world a policy of isolation on our part seems to be not only the surrender of the principle of the collective responsibility of all nations for the maintenance of peace but in actual fact the least effective way to keep our own nation at peace.

I suggest that our next move is to go further in consultation, and carry that principle into European affairs. The isolationist policy which is prevailing in America is taking us far away from consultation, especially in European affairs. Consultation makes it possible to bring out the common interests of both parties.

Question to Mr. Fenwick: What kind of peace machinery do you believe could be set up in place of the League of Nations, which is already set up and which the American public is apparently reluctant to join?

Answer: At present there is a distinct complex against membership in the League of Nations. The only difference would be that a new machinery would not have the name "League of Nations".

Suggestion from Mr. Fenwick: I believe that the time is ripe for President Roosevelt to go to Europe and call a conference of the sixty-three nations signatory to the Pact of Paris.

Applause

MRS BURTON MUSSER, a delegate to the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace spoke also at the Thursday evening session. Mrs Musser was one of the three women delegates to be appointed to the conference. Because the other two women delegates were appointed late, Mrs. Musser said that there was no chance for concerted action on the part of the three women. The women, however, Mrs Musser felt, did their part as individuals, and as individuals the delegates and advisers have no apologies to make.

Mrs. Musser suggested that more background in international relations is needed by women of all countries. Much more could be accomplished if more women studied foreign affairs and made definite

recommendations to delegates when an international conference takes place. Women also can work for the appointment of women on delegations similar to the Inter-American Peace Conference. Therein the women of the United States have a great contribution to make to the peace movement in the world.

The presentation of the peace mandate was the most significant and concrete demonstration of public opinion at the Buenos Aires Conference, Mrs Musser felt. The mandate was greatly appreciated by officials and delegates to the conference. The unofficial peace conference called in Buenos Aires previous to the official conference was unfortunately hampered by the introduction of subjects not german to peace and definitely controversial.

the idea of producing with the hope of selling, and now in the last few years we have suddenly found out that these old ways of doing things are no longer satisfactory. In the words of the old hymn "Time Makes Ancient Good Uncouth."

We now make new patterns of thinking. Instead of being individuals, we are interdependent. Instead of competition, we must have cooperation. Instead of high tariff walls, we must encourage freedom of trade, in order to enrich ourselves and others. Instead of so much emphasis on production we must give more attention to consumption and guaranteed purchasing power so that all can buy the goods produced. Only in this way can we keep mass production going.

All these things are not easy to achieve. Thus far technical changes have meant danger. The same science and the same technology which might give us an age of plenty might also destroy us. Those of you who saw the play "Idiot's Delight" will remember the scientist who exiled himself from his country because his government was not interested in having him use his scientific discoveries for the benefit of humanity. Later, however, when war broke out, he returned to his country to make poison gases. Today mass production is being used all over the world to turn out vast quantities of guns, airplanes and uniforms for armies.

Let me finish this introduction with an illustration from Stuart Chase. Two men are crossing a desert. They have only a small quantity of water between them. In fear, they begin to fight over the bottle of water. But let us suppose that these two men are in a boat, floating on a lake of clear crystal water. It is absurd for them to continue to fight over their bottle of water. In the same way the nations of the world are on the verge of fighting for their economic needs when there is the possibility of satisfying those needs abundantly and peacefully.

KATHARINE S. JAKUES (Mrs Arthur Jaques), *Chairman of Study Commission*
MRS VERA MICHELES DEAN, *Foreign Policy Association*

MARY DUBLIN, *Dept. of Economics, Sarah Lawrence College*

MRS RYLLIS ALEXANDER GOSLIN, *Editor of Headline Books, Foreign Policy Association*

LOIS MACDONALD, *Dept. of Economics, New York University*

MRS. MARION MILLER, *Executive Director, National Council of Jewish Women*

ROSE SCHNEIDERMAN, *President, National Women's Trade Union League*

DR. CAROLINE WARE, *Dept. of History, Sarah Lawrence College and American University*

THERESA WOLFSON, *Dept. of Economics, Brooklyn College*

FRIDAY MORNING SESSION

Presiding, CHARL O. WILLIAMS

Report: Commission on Relation Between War and Economic Life

By MRS. RYLLIS ALEXANDER GOSLIN

IT is not easy to speak for eight other people, especially on so vital and controversial a subject as the economic causes of war. I am glad that part of what I am to say has already been written down by the others. My function is to interpret to you some of the thinking that went into the making of the report—to outline broad general principles and to clarify issues.

First, the commission would like to emphasize the importance of the economic causes of war and their close relationship to other causes. It is easy to see why economic problems have so much to do with war. Economics has to do with the business of making a living and there is a close relationship between the way a man makes his living and with the instinct of self-preservation. There is the desire on the part of an individual or a nation to gain security and there is the fear of losing security. Often a peaceful solution of controversy might be possible if there were not economic factors present to increase the strain.

Secondly, your commission would like to emphasize the complexity of the economic problems that might cause war. It would be easy to blame one group or one class or one nation. But the case is not as simple as that. Economic causes of war reach down into the lives of all of us. We are all concerned with them. Let us outline some of these problems. First there are hungry nations—nations that have difficulty supplying their own needs. They need raw materials. "Why," someone asks, "don't they buy them?" Because they have to have money with which to buy. They can only get that money by selling something they make. And perhaps they do not have anything to sell or they are prevented by tariffs from selling what they make.

Again there are pressure groups within

nations. Nations do not trade as units. Individual merchants within nations carry on trade, and have special interests which they want the governments to protect. International trade as such does not make for peace; instead it may make for dangerous competition. Then there is the internal pressure within a nation that fails to solve its own economic problems satisfactorily. The result of this failure is often class struggle—then increasing pressure—then fascism—then war.

Your commission would like to have you study these problems in the light of the vast changes that have come about in the last thirty or forty years. It is a truism that science and technology have transformed our lives. It started with the industrial revolution back in the middle of the nineteenth century but since the beginning of the twentieth century mass production and the application of scientific methods have wrought vast changes. Let us take an example: Back in the days of hand labor when men used a few tools, a man had one-third of a horsepower of energy to use in addition to his own. In 1900 he had three horsepower. Today he has twenty-seven horsepower. And this is not only true of the factory worker. Life has changed for the farmer. The farmers in the United States in 1928 had thirty-eight times as much mechanical power as in 1900.

And yet the methods of doing business—our economic principles—have not kept pace with the advances of science. During the nineteenth century our system was built up on the principle of individualism, on the encouragement of individual initiative. It was built up on the advantages of competition that made for efficiency and greater production. It was built up on the idea of protecting young and growing industry with a high tariff wall. It was built up on

DISCUSSION

Harry Gideonse — Leader

Question: Can the claim of overpopulation justify colonial expansion?

Answer: It is true that an excess population gives a country a certain recklessness about human lives. There is no evidence that granting new territory would relieve the situation.

Question: Is it true that colonies supply a country with men available for armies in war time in case the mother country goes to war?

Answer: This is a question of the non-economic use of colonies. Up to the present time colonies have on the whole cost more than they actually bring in. France is the only nation at the present time who gets military use out of its colonies. I believe that the only apparent reason for colonies is the rivalry for great landholdings.

Question: Is it possible to lower tariffs on foreign goods from a low standard country without at least for a time lowering our own standard of living?

Answer: If we should suddenly lower tariffs markedly we should notice a decided change in our standard of living, but the present procedure is one of gradation.

Question: Why not devote ourselves exclusively to promoting one particular item of the program?

Answer: This is a typical American point of view—We want something to show for our work at the end of a period. In so doing you are extremely vulnerable and if you fail in your one project the defeat is bitter.

There are two ways of promoting a cause. Some advocate that we should work for a thing irrespective of whether the general public is ready to take it. The second group believes that we should never get too far ahead of the procession, that we should push for things that the public is ready to take on.

Personally, I believe that we are never going to have peace unless we have something very close to world government, but, in America, having "entangling foreign alliances" is not popular. There are four things which would work toward world government: trade agreements program, implementing the Kellogg Pact, membership in the World Court, collective security.

Report: Commission on National Defense

By ESTHER CAUKIN BRUNAUER

THE Eleventh National Conference on the Cause and Cure of War recommended that "the National Committee promote a thorough study of the various aspects of the problem of national defense in order that a constructive program of action may be recommended to the 1937 Conference." In making this recommendation the Conference expressed the view that "tremendously inflated military budgets and the failure of post-war disarmament efforts make imperative new approaches to the problem of armaments," and envisaged as the primary step "a clarification of what is meant by *adequate national defense*." Some of the questions which the Conference thought pertinent to such a clarification were, "Does it mean defense of our citizens abroad as well as at home? The protection of distant territories, including the Philippine Commonwealth? The policing of our lines of foreign trade?" Another line of inquiry which it was thought de-

sirable to pursue was "a consideration of the efficiency of our establishments in the light of modern conditions and inventions."

Pursuant to this recommendation, the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War appointed the Study Commission on National Defense, consisting of fifteen women from all parts of the United States, representing the membership of the participating organizations on as wide a scale as possible. Geography prevented the committee from meeting and the work had to be done by assigning special topics to separate members. The committee has thought of its task in terms of (1) determining facts, (2) synthesizing and coordinating facts, and (3) making recommendations based not only upon the information which its members have gathered on the subject of national defense but also in the light of their experience in the peace movement. Government documents, books, pamphlets, magazine and newspaper articles, and personal interviews are the sources of the information upon which the report of the committee is based. One member was able to make use of an international relations study group in testing her approach to the problem. Another had the aid of advanced students in her department at a university.

Special appreciation is due to the persons who have given time and thought to interviews with members of our committee.

The members of the Commission were: Berthalee Broyles (Mrs. W. A.), State College, Pa.

Lyda May Degener, Bucks County, Pa.

Elizabeth Eastman, Washington, D. C.

Elizabeth Fackl, Denver, Colo.

Elvira Fradkin (Mrs. Leon Henry), Montclair, N. J.

Gladys Murphy Graham (Mrs. Malbone W.), Santa Monica, Calif.

Elizabeth Armstrong Hawes (Mrs. Alexander), Washington, D. C.

Anne Hartwell Johnstone (Mrs. William C.), Washington, D. C.

Katherine Kruse (Mrs. Cornelius), Middleton, Conn.

Alves Long, St. Louis, Mo.

Ernestine Mitler (Mrs.), New York City.

Elinor Purves, Princeton, N. J.

Ruth Shain (Mrs. Charles J.), Birmingham, Mich.

Carrie Weyl (Mrs. Maurice), Philadelphia, Pa.

Esther Caukin Brunauer (Mrs. Stephen), Washington, D. C., *Chairman*.

Six members of the committee gave a summary report of their contributions to the study; Elizabeth Fackl reported on the opinions of responsible officials of the United States Government regarding the purposes of maintaining a military establishment for national defense; Alves Long reported on the study of the movement to combine the War and Navy Departments into a single department of national defense; Mrs. Ruth Shain reported on the national defense needs of the United States if we are to maintain a policy of isolation, Mrs. Elvira Fradkin reported on the military needs of the United States assuming membership in the League of Nations or a similar security system; Mrs. Maurice Weyl reported on

the activities of civic groups in their study of the problem of national defense, and Mrs. Anne Hartwell Johnstone reported on our foreign policy as a non-military form of national defense.

The study on national defense made by Dr. Brunauer and her associates is the first study of its kind ever made by any organization in the United States.

Both reports were accepted and recommended for further study by the Twelfth Conference

ATTENDANCE RECORD

	Delegates	Alternates
American Association of University Women	53	1
National Women's Conference of American Ethical Union	6	
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs	39	
Committee on Women's Work, Foreign Missions Conference of North America	71	
General Federation of Women's Clubs	49	
Council of Women for Home Missions	28	2
National Council of Jewish Women	30	2
National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War	2	
National Women's Trade Union League	37	
National Woman's Christian Temperance Union	31	
National League of Women Voters	49	24
National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations	82	41
Visitors	49	
Delegates	487	
Alternates	70	
Total	606	
Individual single admissions	1,121	

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED:

That the following communication be sent to the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt:

Believing that your success in furthering the Good Neighbor Policy may inspire other nations of the world to follow your constructive leadership in the field of promoting positive steps for world peace we, the delegates of the Twelfth Conference of the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War, ask you to call a conference of the sixty-three nations signatory to the Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war—for the purpose of making applicable throughout the world the principle of consultation adopted by the nations of the Americas at Buenos Aires.

That this delegate body send a communication to the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, expressing profound appreciation of his leadership in inspiring and establishing the cordial relationships which made possible the agreements of the Buenos Aires Inter-American Peace Conference.

DELEGATE'S WORKSHEETS

Information on and extra copies of the Delegate's Worksheet may be secured by writing to the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War Headquarters, 1622 Grand Central Terminal Building, New York City.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

Presiding, MRS ARTHUR BRIN

Ideas Determining an American Peace Program

By DR. EMILY HICKMAN

THE fundamental ideas underlying planning for peace today should be kept clear in our thinking, especially as some of them are being challenged not only by those who are not planning for peace but by those who are.

The idea most fundamental to the work of the Cause and Cure of War Committee is that our aim is to end war—to move toward a world where war is not used. Today this movement has much strength behind it—laws, treaties, peace machinery, statesmen, international conferences, peace organizations, pulpit, press, lecture platform—all aim at this goal. There is one limitation to the program which is proving a sticking point at present, i.e., war for defense. So we are beginning to study what we mean by a war for defense. Recently another challenge has arisen. In the Spanish situation some minds see an attack by fascism upon democracy and are asserting that democracy must protect itself by war. Can democracy protect itself by war? Can democracy endure in a world made desperate by war? Would democracy in France survive another world war? Would it in England? Would it in the United States? War is the great destroyer of democracy—not its ally.

To build a peaceful world requires world peace machinery. Last year tried the use of peace machinery to a new extent. The world tried the experiment of economic sanctions. Success or failure? At first it was judged to be a pretty complete failure. Today belief in the efficacy of economic sanctions is renewing itself. The League is studying the question. Popular opinion seems confident that oil sanctions would have ended the Ethiopian conquest. Even limited as they were, their effect on Italy is today judged to have been serious. The belief in peace machinery is, then, again rallying from what earlier seemed to be a body blow.

We do not yet see clearly whether economic sanctions do or do not involve military sanctions. There are those who are confident that they do. There are others who, after careful study, are becoming convinced that they do not. Evidently the matter is open for further investigation. Certainly the one time they were applied, they did not involve military sanctions.

Another matter to be discussed in connection with the peace machinery is whether military sanctions, if worked, can be so controlled as to be really different from war. Here again thought and investigation is needed. The peace machinery, this summer, probably met its most severe challenge since its existence. It reeled under the impact but is rallying. We may still believe in peace machinery.

One encouraging aspect of the health of peace machinery is that it is taking a broader view of its job. It now hopes to set itself to avoiding disputes by remedying bad economic conditions, altering unjust treaties, and, if disputes arise, tackling them more effectively at an earlier stage of development.

Another challenge to our ideas lies in the great rearmament programs. Will they breed war or peace? Today much opinion speaks of them as peace breeders. In the present critical situation that may be true, though it is very doubtful, but grant

the crisis behind us—will the nations drop their armament or will they carry them on into other days when the danger of using them will not be so great and the temptation therefore stronger?

These are the questions before us:

Shall we aim to end war or believe in its efficacy to aid us?

Shall we work for the development and use of peace machinery or stand aside from that movement?

Shall we attempt to ease the economic world strain or shall we isolate ourselves from world trade?

Shall we endorse the armament race or shall we struggle at least to check it in its tracks?

These are the fundamental questions you and I must answer

PROGRAM FOR 1937

Recommended to the Eleven Participating Organizations by the Twelfth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War

I. GENERAL STATEMENT OF AIMS

THE eleven member organizations of the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War join in sponsoring the annual conference as a source of both inspiration and concrete suggestions for their efforts to establish world peace. Each organization carries on a broad program of which the work for international peace is one division. The setting-up of peace departments has come about because these organizations, motivated by high ideals for their own nation and the human race, realize that the prevention of war is a necessary condition for the attainment of their primary objectives in whatever field they lie—religion, education, civic life, social problems, or economic relations.

Successive conferences have recognized that the problem of war is highly complex, but we believe that it is not insoluble. The complexity of the problem requires that many groups should work toward its solution, although not necessarily in the same way nor with the same emphasis. The National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War can contribute most effectively to the peace movement by finding the common interests in the international programs of the participating organizations, enabling them to correlate their activities where intensive efforts of large numbers of citizens are most needed.

In order to carry on our activities it is necessary to protect the democratic practices of free speech, free press and free assembly. If these be lost, the opportunity to work on a constructive program for peace would be hampered if not completely denied.

In planning this program we are not unmindful of the need of high spiritual concepts which are necessary for its achievement, and which must constitute the per-

sonal dynamic of living for each participating individual.

II. RECOMMENDED 1937 PROGRAM FOR SUPPORT AND STUDY

The Twelfth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War recommends to its participating organizations that they concentrate their efforts on the following during the year 1937:

A. Issues now before the country for action:

1. Revision of the neutrality policy of the United States.
a. support of legislation to implement the announced policy of the United States "to avoid being drawn into war and not to contribute to the prolongation of war"
b. promotion of public understanding of the significance of the new American attitude toward neutrality, with special emphasis on the relation of the neutrality policies of the United States to the collective efforts of other nations to maintain international peace by cooperative methods
2. The continued support of national control of the manufacture of and trade in arms, ammunition, and the implements of war
3. Support of the maintenance of the reciprocal trade agreement program of the United States as a means of relaxing international economic tensions and contributing to the restoration of international trade
4. Opposition to the continuously expanding budgets for the army, navy and air forces as being inconsistent with our commitments under the Pact of Paris, this opposition to be dependent upon the clarification of our fundamental policies concerning national defense
5. Abolition of compulsory military training in schools and colleges
6. Prompt ratification of conventions adopted at Buenos Aires by the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace
7. Taking full advantage of the membership of the United States in the International Labor Organization with a view to furthering social and economic justice throughout the world as an indispensable basis for peace.

B. Fundamental issues on which the United States must be preparing itself to act.

(a) *The conference reaffirms its recommendations of support of the following, and urges the participating organizations which have not yet gone on record in their favor to do so during the coming year*

1. Membership of the United States in the League of Nations on terms consistent with its commitments under the Pact of Paris
2. Adherence of the United States to the World Court.
3. Reduction of armaments by international agreement

(b) *The Conference recommends the study of the following*

1. Implementation of Pact of Paris through a provision for consultation by the signatory states in the event of the violation of the Pact
2. Ways of extending the good neighbor policy into the Pacific area with special emphasis on the immigration laws of the United States for the purpose of determining whether there is any necessity for the present provisions which discriminate racially against the oriental peoples

III. PROGRAM FOR IMMEDIATE CONSIDERATION

In the attempt to make greater progress in the promotion of peace, the Conference recommends to its member organizations for urgent consideration the following subjects judged by the delegates to be, at present, the most essential points of its program

A. For legislative action:

1. Revision of the neutrality policy of the United States through legislation designed to keep our country out of war and to permit cooperation with other nations to prevent war.

This legislation shall provide as follows

- a. This country shall consult with the other nations signatory to the Pact of Paris whenever there is a threat to peace
- b. An immediate impartial embargo shall be declared against the nations directly involved in the threat to peace
- c. The embargo shall include munitions, credits and essential war materials.
- d. The embargo may be removed by the President from a nation which, as the result of the consultation, is agreed to be the victim of aggression

2. Continuation of the present reciprocal trade agreement program as this country's practical contribution to the international economic stability essential to the maintenance of peace

3. Prompt ratification of conventions adopted at Buenos Aires by the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace

B. For study:

1. Economic causes of war covering the unsatisfied needs of nations, the pressure of minority groups within nations and economic practices that produce international friction and examining the possibility of solving these problems in the light of modern science and technology
2. The subject of national defense especially
 - a. The varying concepts of national defense
 - b. The institutions, namely the departments of State, War and Navy, developed on the basis of these concepts
 - c. The relation of these concepts and institutions to the problem of preventing war

Report: Marathon Round Tables

By MRS. FREDERIC BEGGS, *Chairman*

ON JANUARY 28, 1937, four months from the time the kits were assembled the office had received 602 registrations for Marathon material. A few kits have been sold for individual use. On the other hand, kits have been passed around between groups in some instances. The committee has made a valiant attempt to determine just how many of the kits are being used by actual groups, but reports are still incomplete. The large majority of the registrations represent such groups.

Registrations for material have been made by 47 states, the District of Columbia and Alaska. The largest number of registrations have come from New Jersey, 69, New York, 56 and Illinois, 51. Delaware reports no registrations. At this date the registrations have increased in 24 states. Registrations have been made in each of the ten states that failed to register last year. Kansas shows the largest percentage of increase, 1935, none, 1936, 19.

Two types of material have been offered this year, a kit of simple material for beginning groups, and a kit of advanced material posing two hypothetical questions which might confront the United States in its relationships, first with South America, second with the Far East and a third problem concerning Europe—to be based on events at the time of study.

The majority of groups reporting are mixed groups, representing a number of organizations. The groups have been sponsored by member organizations of the National Committee, or by interested individuals, the Federation of Women's Clubs showing the largest number of groups. The membership of the groups represent a great diversity of race, creed, opinion and training as in former years. About a third include both men and women in their membership. One group is made up of executives of young peoples' groups.

The community activities include the following: numerous community meetings, literature displays, talks to clubs, church groups, etc., by state chairmen and members of the committee, radio programs, regional conferences, peace plays.

No statistical reports can possibly begin to measure the interest or achievements of the Marathon groups. A number of permanent peace groups have been founded as a result of the efforts of Marathon members, and the Marathon groups are cooperating more and more effectively with other organizations.

STATE CHAIRMEN—MARATHON ROUND TABLES—1936

- Arizona—Mrs. M. C. Rand, Route 6, Box 1384, Phoenix
 Arkansas—Mrs. J. M. Stinson, 509 North Washington St., Camden.
 No California—Mrs. Harry Geballe, 2801 Lake St., San Francisco.

- So California—Mrs. John C. Urquhart, 1673 Roosevelt Ave., Los Angeles.
 Colorado—Mrs. Herbert E. Martin, 2300 South York St., Denver
 Asst. State Chm.: Mrs. Farrington Carpenter, Hayden
 Denver Chm.: Mrs. Ernest A. Zelliot, 2349 Ivy Street, Denver.
 Connecticut—Mrs. May Bell Harper, Box 566, New Haven
 Asst. State Chm.: Mrs. Walter Johnson, 52 Dover Road, New Britain.
 Florida—Mrs. William L. Wilson, 2822 St. John's Ave., Jacksonville.
 Georgia—Mrs. M. E. Tilly, 408 Wesley Memo Bldg., Atlanta
 Illinois—Mrs. Oscar S. Marx, "Hillcrest", Mount Carmel
 Chicago Chm.: Miss Genevieve Forsberg, Room 1532, 120 S. La Salle, Chicago
 Indiana—Miss Amy Rloye, 214 Varsity Apts., West Lafayette
 Iowa—Mrs. Joseph Mier, 722 Grand Court, Davenport.
 Kansas—Mrs. Leo Gessell, 1301 West 16th St., Topeka.
 Kentucky—Mrs. Emmet Horine, 1509 Rosewood Ave., Louisville
 Maine—Mrs. E. M. Godfrey, 172 Kenduskeag Ave., Bangor.
 Michigan—Mrs. John K. Ormond, 627 Wadlington Road, Birmingham.
 Minnesota—Mrs. Schuyler Woodhull, 2417 Pillsbury Ave., Minneapolis.
 Missouri—Miss Louise Warren Johnson, 632 N. 24th St., Saint Joseph.
 Montana—Mrs. Emory B. Pease, 134 Third Ave., North, Glasgow.
 Nebraska—Miss Gertrude Eaton, R. F. D. No. 1, North Bend.
 New Mexico—Mrs. W. W. McClellan, Shiprock
 New Jersey—Mrs. Walter L. Kilde, Jr., 8 Winding Way, Verona.
 New York—Miss Arthur Jaques, 243 Atlantic Ave., Lynbrook.
 Westchester Co.—Mrs. James Picker, 87 Boulevard, New Rochelle
 Metropolitan Chm.: Mrs. M. S. Armstrong, 301 West 108th St., New York City
 Ohio—Mrs. Miles F. Buxler, 2038 Cornell Road, Cleveland
 Oregon—Mrs. G. L. Buland, 1767 S. E. Maple St., Portland.
 E. Pennsylvania—Mrs. Frank Miles Day, Allen's Lane, Mt. Airy, Philadelphia.
 W. Pennsylvania—Mrs. A. H. Bowman, 49 Sprague Ave., Bellevue, Pittsburgh.
 Rhode Island—Miss Alice W. Hunt, 2 Angell St., Providence.
 Texas—Mrs. H. C. Franks, 4407 Avenue O, Galveston
 Utah—Mrs. J. J. Fitzgerald, 1444 Stratford Ave., Salt Lake City
 Virginia—Mrs. R. McLean Whittett, 12 Laburnum Court, Richmond.
 Washington—Mrs. H. E. Maltby, 1425—33rd Ave., South, Seattle.
 West Virginia—Mrs. Oliver Shurtleff, 1264 Bryant St., Fairmont.
 Wisconsin—Mrs. George Ettenheim, 2643 N. Lake Drive, Milwaukee.
 Wyoming—Mrs. Veinon S. Griffith, Rock Ridge Ranch, Clearmont.
 District of Columbia—Dr. Esther Caukin Brunauer, 1634 I St., NW, Washington.

States in Which There Is No Chairman

- | | |
|---------------|----------------|
| Alabama | New Hampshire |
| Delaware | North Carolina |
| Idaho | North Dakota |
| Louisiana | Oklahoma |
| Maryland | South Carolina |
| Massachusetts | South Dakota |
| Mississippi | Tennessee |
| Nevada | Vermont |

FRIDAY EVENING SESSION

Presiding, JOSEPHINE SCHAIN

Civil Liberties and Peace

By SPENCER BRODNEY

THERE is an intimate relationship between the preservation of civil liberties and the maintenance of peace. Each is necessary to the other. If we are not free to speak, write and take counsel together in public assemblage, obviously we are unable to offer any effective opposition to the makers of war. On the other hand, we know only too well once a nation becomes engaged in armed conflict, the rights guaranteed by the most democratic of constitutions are in danger of being ignored and suppressed. All this is not news, for there is a saying that comes down from Roman days to the effect that in time of war the laws are silent. In modern war-time vernacular this usually takes the form of "Shut up—we've got to win the war," and is held to justify every arbitrary act of those in authority.

In theory the existence of civil liberties, the various rights that a free and democratic people are able to exercise, should be highly effective in preventing a nation from being plunged into war against its will, but actually this is not so. We know that if the government of any of the great democratic nations decided on war, however much the people may be against it, the government will get its own way and the people will have to submit to whatever measures the government decides are necessary for the successful prosecution of its aims. We had a striking demonstration of this after the United States entered the World War. No historian any longer denies that the American people as a people has no desire to take part in that war. In fact, it is now usual to say that America was "dragged in," just as we fear that if there is another war we shall be "dragged in" and not go in as an act of the free will of the people as a whole.

It seems then that if there is still this danger despite the existence of well-established rights the exercise of which might keep us out of war, there is something lacking somewhere, and that we ought to look into the matter somewhat more closely than we have. That inquiry, I suggest, should begin by asking how these existing civil liberties of ours are actually regarded and exercised by the people at large. Do they really prize them as part of the system of democratic government established for the purpose of developing a worthy civilization? I do not think so, for the simple reason that unconcern about civil liberties is only part of a much larger and more dangerous fundamental trouble. That is the vast and terrifying indifference of the great majority of the people to everything that makes not only for social

progress, including peace itself, but even for the advancement of their own individual interests, including their material welfare.

A great many of our assumptions about what the people believe in, and certainly what they believe in strongly enough to impel them to action, are quite false and misleading. Not only is it such an assumption to say that they are concerned about their civil liberties, one can go still further to say that, despite the belief that the strongest motive in human nature is to satisfy material wants, the great mass of mankind is actually indifferent to its material welfare. Otherwise, how can one account for the fact that so many millions of the world's population are living under the conditions they do—and submitting to them as quietly as sheep? That is one of the most astounding characteristics of the human race, one that we are continually losing sight of, though it is part of the explanation why both the appeal to sweetness and light of the liberal idealists as well as the more strenuous agitation of the proletarian revolutionaries meet with so little success. The human race does not want to know what is best for it and does not take much notice if it is told.

I have said that the people at large are not greatly concerned about civil liberties and even about their material welfare. One might now go further and say that they really have no deep regard for the sacredness of life itself, whether their own or others. That seems to be proved by the fact that throughout human history there has hardly been a time when there was not a war somewhere, and that fighting has been regarded as a matter of course.

All this might seem to spring from a poor opinion of people in the mass. But none of us should feel very superior, for we too are all part of this same inept, blundering species. The only difference is that some of us wish to get rid of the social evils and prevent the disasters that threaten civilization. What then is it that prevents them from wanting to be saved or from striving to save themselves? The answer seems to be that most men and women are still almost as dumb and inarticulate as the other members of the animal kingdom.

Take this matter of freedom of speech, the right to say anything we wish. What can such a right mean to those who have nothing to say or no interest in what is said to them? Free speech can be only the privilege of a few, if the mass of the people are inarticulate and uncomprehending. What good is our right to speak freely for peace if no one is listening or wants to listen? Agitation and propaganda for peace have been going on for many years. No

cause could ever have had such a tremendously shocking example to enforce its lessons as has the peace movement of these days, for most of us still have vivid memories of the most horrible war in the history of the world. Yet we know that the maintenance of peace is extremely uncertain because the great mass of the people are not opposed to war as deeply and genuinely as we should expect them to be, because when once more the bugles blow and the drums beat they will accept a state of war in the same unthinking spirit of acquiescence as they accept any of the other evils that afflict them.

The problem of mass indifference and inertia is one that has been fully understood only in recent times and then it has engaged systematic attention only for commercial reasons among the members of a typically modern profession, that of advertising and publicity. Though the advertising man's purpose is to induce the populace to part with money and buy the goods he wishes to sell, the fundamental nature of his task is no different from that of the peace-lover trying to enlist popular support for his cause, and make people understand that peace is a supreme good devoutly to be desired. The problem is to stir some sort of response from the mass of the people who live in a world that it is difficult for the thinking person to understand. The question then for the propagandist of social welfare no less than for the advertising man, is how to break into this curious world of obliviousness and stir these human animals into believing they should want something they have not wanted before.

In reply to all this it will be said by some that the mass of the people are not definitely and consciously concerned about liberty or peace because of the influence exerted in the opposite direction by the small minority of acquisitive and unscrupulous men who have been able to gather into their hands the power to dictate our national destinies. It is idle to pretend that the people are ignorant because they are kept in ignorance.

The real enemies of peace are not the professional warmongers, the manufacturers of munitions, the promoters of colonial enterprise and beneficiaries of allied industrial and financial interests. The real enemies of peace are the millions of men and women who are indifferent to the dangers that some of us at least know will surely destroy civilization if they are not averted.

Archimedes said that if he had a lever big enough he could move the world. The upholder of civil liberties, the exponent of social progress and the worker for peace have before them a somewhat similar task. They have to find some means of prying loose this enormous inert mass of human indifference. At the moment it seems improbable, but the reassuring fact is that the history of the race is full of the attainment of things long unattainable.

The Dilemma of the Liberal

By ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

LIBERALISM has been defined as a state of mind. A dilemma is an acute state of mind. It is not surprising that liberalism in a time of extreme tension between opposing forces should find itself perplexed and uncertain in its effort to apply intelligence to human affairs.

The dilemma of liberalism in regard to war is not new. War has been part of the historic process, and certain gains in civilization, such as religious freedom, may be attributed to war. It is possible to make a distinction as a matter of history between bad wars and good wars. Bacon made it.

On the basis of the influence of war on individual character Ruskin confessed himself in a dilemma.

The liberal cabinet of Great Britain found itself in a dilemma in August, 1914.

In the course of the first years of the war the liberal administration of the United States found itself in a dilemma of increasingly critical nature. The immediate economic interests of the country, and the sympathies of the most important and articulate people, were on the side of the Entente. Hence with some scruples the administration committed itself to a course of rationalization and propaganda.

At the close of the war the victors were confronted by a dilemma: whether to follow Lord Balfour's advice and form a military alliance so strong that danger from the defeated would be *nil*; or to follow Wilson's advice and form a league for collective security. As Walter Millis has remarked, they did in effect neither, for they did both. The dilemma of liberals in the United States forced them into two groups: those who thought we should trust the League of Nations to remedy the wrongs of the Treaty of Versailles, and those who believed that the League would show itself as an alliance of victors and tend to perpetuate those wrongs of the Treaty.

Such divided counsels persist today and constitute the dilemma of the liberals in the United States. It is no longer a question between collective security on the one hand through a general league seeking to do justice by isolation. It is a question between uniting with other pacific nations in an alliance or understanding to repress those which threaten and make war, or so defining and maintaining neutrality as to give no possible opportunity for being drawn in. The first policy, carried to its logical extreme, would lead to a preventive war; the second would lead to complete abstention from intercourse with nations at war.

The dilemma is often expressed thus: Shall we make our chief effort to keep war out of the world, or to keep the United States out of war? Obviously

there is ultimately no incompatibility between the two positions. In the long run, it may be admitted that the second depends on the first, but at the moment the chief contribution to the first objective is by way of the second.

We should bear in mind the lesson from our participation in the last war. It is probable that had the United States not intervened, peace would have been made in 1917. Our intervention prolonged the war and gave the victors overwhelming power which they used to make a treaty containing the seeds of future war. It is also clear that we began to draft into the war when we allowed our neutrality to convert this country into an auxiliary arsenal for the Entente, and then continued to involve our economy with theirs until we could not accept their defeat. As M. Tardieu has remarked: After the first loan of \$500,000,000 to the allies their success was essential to the United States. As a first emergency measure in the face of war the United States should define its neutrality in such stringent terms as to make our involvement as remote as possible, and endeavor to induce as many other nations as possible to adopt the same policy—to try to starve the war by cutting off supplies, and then to make the abstention of the United States from all forms of participation in the war first contribution to general peace.

For the liberal there can be no other

National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War

*Report of Nominating Committee—
January 29, 1937*

Honorary Chairman—MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT

Chairman—MISS JOSEPHINE SCHAIN

First Vice-chairman—DR. EMILY HICKMAN

Second Vice-chairman—MRS. EDGERTON PARSONS

Third Vice-chairman—DR. ESTHER CAULKIN BRUNAUER

Secretary—MRS. WILLIAM DICK SPORBORG

Treasurer—MRS. HENRY HILL PIERCE

Members of National Committee:

MISS LOUISE F. BACHE
MRS. FREDERIC BEGGS
MRS. FRED S. BENNETT
MISS AMY BRADSHAW
MRS. MAY BELL HARPER
MISS ALVES LONG
MISS KATE MILLER
MISS ESTHER G. OGDEN
MRS. ROBERT S. POWELL
MISS HENRIETTA ROELOFS
MISS ANNA LORD STRAUSS
MRS. CARROLL SUDLER
MRS. HARRISON THOMAS
MRS. MAURICE N. WEYL

answer. War is the antithesis of all that liberalism means and stands for.

Liberalism disappears, goes underground, in time of war. In the denial of intelligence which a state of war enforces we cannot trust the behavior of other nations or our own. In the last war the liberal position stated by President Wilson in his peace without victory speech and enforced by his efforts to bring the antagonists to negotiations was the true one. But these efforts were fatally compromised by hostages already given. The strongest reason why the Entente would not take Wilson's advice and make peace was that they saw that inevitably he must join them. And once in the war liberals in the United States, as already in Great Britain and France, lost control of the situation and forsook their own faith in vain rationalizations about the war to end war.

Another dilemma has arisen to confront the liberal. Granted that we have achieved the beginnings of a neutral policy in respect to international war, should that policy be extended to civil war? The horns of this dilemma are sharpened by the fact that in all countries the economic opposition called the class struggle is becoming so acute that the world is threatened with civil war everywhere superimposed upon any future international war.

Personally my opinion is that a policy of neutrality is for the purpose of keeping this country out of war and for no other purpose, and that the United States of all democratic countries, is in a position to aid the Spanish government without danger of being drawn into war; and that the action of Congress in passing special legislation refusing to the lawful government of Spain the aid to which it was entitled under international law and by precedents which our country has always insisted on, was hasty and ill-considered, and, as Senator Nye noted, may jeopardize the whole neutrality program.

Meanwhile there are certain matters before the liberal which fortunately offer no cause for indecision—in regard to which no dilemma can arise. The causes of war can be designated as economic and nationalistic. The former are usually the more remote, the latter the more immediate. The economic causes, even in a time of peace, manifest themselves as hostilities—tariff and currency attacks and reprisals to which we properly give the name of wars.

The liberal will devote himself to removing the causes of both international and civil war by seeking economic justice between nations and among classes in the same nation. And he will recognize the danger of war in the spirit of nationalism, so ignorantly and violently forwarded in school, in the pulpit, in the press, and seek to mitigate it.

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



112 317

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY